Vol VIII.] AUGUST, 1951 [Part 4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE



ALLAHABAD

Vol. VIII] AUGUST, 1951 [Part 4

THE JOURNAL OF THE GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE



ALLAHABAD

Second Edition March 1975

Published by
Mm. Dr. Umesha Mishra,
Ganganatha Jha Research Institute,
Allahabad

Printed by
Rajesh Publications
At Swarn Printing Press
New Delhi

JOURNAL
OF THE
GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

AUGUST, 1951

CONTENTS

JOURNAL

OF THE

GANGANATHA JHA RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Vol. VIII] AUGUST, 1951 [Part 4

DATE OF THE BHĀRATA WAR

By TARAKESHWAR BHATTACHARYA

(*Reply to the Rejoinder by Prof. P. C. Sen Gupta*)

THE majority of readers pass over articles containing mathematical discussions. It is gratifying to me that Prof. Sen Gupta has been so very kind as to take notice of my humble paper and the trouble to publish a rejoinder thereon.

He says[1] that in the absence of any archaeological evidence we have to depend on the *Mahābhārata* alone. We also hold the same view and proposed[2] not to depend on any tradition, nor to assume any date, at the outset, but to follow strictly and honestly the evidences of the *Mahābhārata* alone and thereby try to get to the date of the Bhārata War, if possible.

There are certainly different approaches to the subject, such as, numismatic, epigraphic, archaeological, traditional, chronological (Paurāṇic Geneologies), etc. All may yield good results; but for ourselves, we chose a very narrow line, i.e., to use as data only the *Mahābhārata* statements of eminent personages of the times, such as, Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa, Mārkaṇḍeya, Vyāsa and others.

My paper was not a criticism of Professor Sen Gupta's work "*The Ancient Indian Chronology*." I happened to

[1] Rejoinder by Prof. P. C. Sen Gupta in the *JGJRI*, Vol. VIII, Pt. 2. p. 204.

[2] *Date of the Bhārata War* by author, *Ibid.* Pt. 1. p. 15.

refer to some of his views, to make it clear, wherein I differed from him and why. For instance, I may mention the following facts. I accepted the truth of the *Mahābhārata* evidences first and my result, the date of the Bhārata War, came out last, as derived from those evidences, taken as the data of my problem. Prof. Sen Gupta's procedure was just the reverse of it. He borrowed his date (2449 B.C.) from *Bṛhat-Saṁhitā* of Varāha, (6th cent. A.D.), without questioning the truth of it. But as the calendar dates for this year (2449 B.C.) did not tally with the statements, as given in the *Mahābhārata*, he could not accept them wholly but had to modify them, to suit his year of the war. Varāha himself did not claim his date for Yudhiṣṭhira's time to have any historical or astronomical truth behind it, but used it only for the purpose of astrological predictions. We shall come again to this question later.

In reply to his rejoinder, I propose to follow the sequences of the objections raised, as far as practicable.

Objection I (pp. 204-5)

His first objection is, that I said[3] that the system of Astronomy in the time of the Bhārata War was of fairly advanced type. In this connection, Prof. Sen Gupta gives here some of his personal views, as self-evident truths and means to say, that I had no business to go against them. They are as follows :—

(1) " The Indian Scientific Siddhāntas came into being from ......499 A.D., the time of Āryabhaṭṭa.

(2) " The writer's date of the Bhārata War is 1432 B.C. This was also the Vedāṅga age.

(3) " The solar months were not in existence, not to speak of their being known in those times. In the whole of the *Mahābhārata*, there is no mention or enumeration of the signs of the zodiac.

---

[3] *Date of the Bhārata War* by author (*JGRI* Nov. 1950)

(4) "It must be admitted that the astronomical events, leading to the date of the Bhārata War, were astronomically observed ones. Even the winter solstice day was an observed event, carefully determined."

In order to follow all the above points, advanced by Prof. Sen Gupta, we have to add another of his assumptions. This is given below as (4a).

(4a) " We are to understand by the term *nakṣatra* simply a *star* or a *star group*".[4]

Prof. Sen Gupta did not choose to supplement his views with arguments. But, for ourselves, we prefer not to follow him. We proceed to meet these points with reasons, as best as we can. We propose to begin with the last points (4) and (4a).

Points (4) *and* (4*a*). Professor Sen Gupta condescends to admit that the people of the *Mahābhārata* age could correctly *observe* astronomical events at least and could carefully determine also, by *observation*, the winter solstice even He means thereby to say that the events mentioned in the *Mahābhārata* were not derived from any calculation; for, that would imply the knowledge, on the part of the people, of the nature of the motions of the sun, the moon and the planets, which in their turn, again, would imply the existence of an advanced system of Astronomy.

But, are all the events directly observable ? There are some instances of events which were not matters of observation. Take for instance, the cases of Jyeṣṭhā in conjuction with the sun[5] on the amāvāsyā day and the nakṣatra Revatī[6] in the morning of a day when Kṛṣṇa set out for Hastināpur,

---

[4] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 10.

[5] सप्तमाच्चापि दिवसादमावास्या भविष्यति।
संग्रामं युज्यतां तस्यां तामाहुः शक्रदैवताम्॥

[6] ततो व्यपेते तमसि सूर्ये विमले उद्गते।
कौमुदे मासि रेवत्यां प्रययौ मधुसूदनः।

on a peace mission. In the first case, Jyeṣṭhā, with sun close to it, was clearly not an object of observation. In the other case it was day-time, at the time of Kṛṣṇa's departure and the moon and the nakṣatra Revatī were then below the horizon. Here also the necessary observation was out of question. Professor Sen Gupta knows of this quite well.

There are statements, in the *Mahābhārata*, relating to future events also. Events cannot be observed before they actually happen. Vyāsadeva spoke of the full moon in Citrā, months before it actually took place. Kṛṣṇa also is said to have spoken of amāvāsyā in Jyeṣṭhā, 7 days before the actual occurrence. Prof. Sen Gupta evades this question by saying[7] "When the speech was made, the aṣṭaka or the last quarter of the current month of Kārtika had ust begun. At the mean rate, the moon takes about 7.5 days to pass from Regulus to Antares. Hence, in the latter half of the previous night, the straight edge of the dichotomised moon was probably observed, as almost passing through the star Regulus. This formed the basis of this prediction of the coming new moon." That the prediction was accurate and exact is undeniable. Prof. Sen Gupta has shown it[8] by rigorous calculations. Let us accept the basis of the prediction, for the present, and be permitted to go into the question a little further, to enable us to determine the implication behind it.

From the particular phase (dichotomy) of the moon, Kṛṣṇa came to know that the sun at the moment was just ahead of the moon (and also of Regulus) by exactly 90°. From the known position of Regulus, the exact position of the sun, among the stars, is therefore obtained. The distance of Antares from Regulus was already known. Hence, the distance between the sun and Antares was accurately known. Thus far it is quite clear. But how could Kṛṣṇa

[7] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, p. 4.

[8] *Ibid*, p. 17.

know exactly what time the sun would take to pass over this (distance i.e. the distance between Antares and the sun) according to his *true* motion ? The moon also reached the sun, on the predicted day, by her own *true* motion. Only looking at the moon or the star in conjunction does not enable one to predict future events correctly, unless one has the additional requisite knowledge, to utilize the observational experience, to yield definite informations of the future. As the prediction came to be exactly fulfilled, Kṛṣṇa must be given the credit of having this additional knowledge, which consists of the correct ideas as to following points :—

(1) mean daily motions of the sun and the moon,
(2) positions and motions of the apogees of the sun and the moon and their use in converting mean motion to true motion and *vice versa*.

These constitute what is termed as the system of Astronomy. If the results obtained be correct, the system becomes necessarily advanced. Prof. Sen Gupta accedes to the correctness and consistency of the astronomical event given in the *Mahābhārata*. Hence, he has to accept as well the fact that they were based on some advanced system of Astronomy.

If it was possible for Kṛṣṇa to predict correctly for 7 days, it might be possible for him to do the same, for longer intervals as well. It was not necessary to look at the skies and observe every time, if one was required to make any statement; only one correct set of astronomical information, for a particular epoch, could suffice for the prediction of all the future events. This was most likely the practice that was followed in those days also.

The sort of observation, assumed to have been followed by Kṛṣṇa, as suggested by Prof. Sen Gupta, seems at first to be convincing; but it is impracticable in most cases. In his year of the war (2449 B.C.) it was certainly impossible. For, the middle of the Kṛṣṇā 8th fell at about 5 P.M. on the

14th October when the longitude of the moon was about 91° 40′. The longitude of the star Regulus for that year was 88° 20′. So the moon was not conjoined to it at dichotomy. Again, to observe the moon, Kṛṣṇa had to wait for 7 more hours, as the moon could not rise before midnight that day (being Kṛṣṇā 8th). By that time, her longitude would increase to about 95°. So when she was possible to be observed by Kṛṣṇa, the moon was ahead of Regulus by more than 6°. Hence the method suggested by Prof. Sen Gupta could not have been followed by Kṛsna. So Kṛsna must have done without that.

Similar reasons are applicable to correct statements for the past events also. The truths of them cannot be ascertained by observations made at the present time only. They must have some sort of advanced calculations behind them. So we have to come to the irresistable conclusion, that the people of the *Mahābhārata* age had a fairly advanced system of Astronomy, which enabled them to make correct statements of the past, the present, and the future events. We hope, Prof. Sen Gupta would have no objection to this now.

Point (4a). The view of Professor Sen Gupta that the term nakṣatra must, in all cases, be taken to mean a *star or a star group* only, is against all traditions, both ancient and modern. Yet he followed this view, in all his researches. He has never advanced any reason for such an arbitrary statement. In the absence of such reasons, we are not in a position to meet them. But we are of opinion that this view of his is apt to mislead other people. In the field of serious historical researches, this sort of irresponsible and dogmatic assertions must be considered as dangerous and of little worth.

Point (1). The condition of astronomical knowledge, in Āryabhaṭṭa's time, was indeed an advanced one and we have seen above, that in Yudhiṣṭhira's time also it was fairly advanced. It is also known that there was a dearth of

advanced knowledge in Astronomy in the centuries just preceding Āryabhaṭṭa. How are we to account for this? It must be admitted therefore that there ensued a decline or deterioration in the knowledge of Astronomy during the interval between these epochs. We know practically nothing of the Indian History of the period between Yudhiṣṭhira and Chandra Gupta (Mauryya). We may infer that India did not pass through peaceful times all through and that a dark age intervened between these dates. Even in the *Mahābhārata*, we have indications to this effect. Arjuna, the greatest of the heroes of the time, was overpowered by the savage Abhīras of the north-west, on his way back from Dwārakā, and failed to save the ladies of Kṛṣṇa's household, whom he had been escorting. Yudhiṣṭhira himself divided his empire between Parikṣita and Vajra. During Parikṣita's time, there took place the rise of a barbarous people named the Nāgas and a distinct animosity between Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas came into being in Janamejaya's reign. From all these, it may be inferred that after Yudhiṣṭhira, his great empire fell to pieces, and began to be devastated by hordes of barbarians from beyond the borders. This seems to have continued for a long period. In the din and turmoil of these times, Ancient India had to suffer a great deal and had to lose amongst others, the glorious treasure of ancient culture, both religious and secular, including the precious knowledge of Astronomy of the *Mahābhārata* age. If the mist surrounding the history of this period is ever cleared off, it is hoped, that many of the paradoxes baffling all our attempts at present may come to be finally solved and the mist cleared off.

Point (2). According to Prof. Sen Gupta, the date of *Vedāṅga-Jyotiṣa* is 1429 B.C.[9] My date for the date of the war is 1432-31 B.C. So he says that my date belongs to the age of the *Vedāṅga-Jyotiṣa*.

---

[9] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by Prof. P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 191.

He imagines that the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* came into being in 1429 B.C. The view is erroneous. *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* has a long past. The years of the five yearly cycle of this system are referred to in the *Śukla Yajurveda*[10] and in the *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*[11], some of these months are also found mentioned in the *Ṛg Veda* even[12]. The number of civil days (366) and the number of tithis (372) in a solar year, which are the characteristics of this system are also referred to in the *Kṛṣṇa-Yajurveda*[13]. Prof. Sen Gupta himself acknowledges the existence of the five yearly cycles of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*, so far back, as 3000 B.C.[14] These clearly show that the system of *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* could not have originated in so late a date as 1429 B.C.

The *Mahābhārata* itself contains the gist of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*. Bhīṣma made use of the elements of this system, in the Virāṭa Parva[15], to determine, if the period of exile of the Pāṇḍavas had been over. If the nearness of my date of the Bhārata War (1432 B.C.) to the assumed epoch (1429 B.C.) of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*, makes my year of the war to belong to the age of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣia*, then the actual inclusion of the same system in the *Mahābhārata*, makes the *Mahābhārata* itself to be more so, though the date of the war given by Prof. Sen Gupta was 2429 B.C. But he could not call his date to be belonging to the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* age.

There are enough evidences to show that the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* was never used either before 1429 B.C., or after, for the framing of almanacs or for determining the calendar

---

10 *Śukla Yajurveda*, 27.45

11 *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*, 5.5.7

12 *Ṛg veda Saṁhitā*, 1.110.4, 7.10.3, 1.8.9, etc.

13 *Kṛṣṇa Yajurveda*, 5,1.10.

14 *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 21.

Māhābhārta, Virāṭa-Parva, Ch. 45, vol. 314.

events for any year[16]. That the *Mahābhārata* did not follow the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* in actual practice, is quite evident. The following reasons may suffice for the purpose :

(1) According to the requirements of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*, the 1st days of the solar Māgha should begin with only one of the following tithis namely Śukla 1st, Śukla 13th, Kṛṣṇa 12 h, Śukla 7th, and Kṛṣṇa 4th and no other, whereas according to the *Mahābhārata*, it was the middle of the Śukla 8th, at the noon of the day.

(2) According to Kṛṣṇa's statement, the war began on the *amāvāsyā* day. The tithi, at noon on this day was 29.822. Bhīṣma expired just 67 days later. The change in tithi during the interval according to *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*, would be 8.089. So the tithi, according to the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*, at noon of the day, would have been 7.911 Śukla, showing that the 4th quarter of the lunar month began at about 2 a.m. in the previous night. But according to Bhīṣma's statement, it ought to have taken place about noon of the very day of his expiry. The discrepancy produced, in the short period of only 67 days, is quite appreciable. If the interval between the two events were much greater, the results, would have shown an enormous difference.

Prof. Sen Gupta has divided the historic times in two clear-cut divisions, by the yearline 1429 B.C. : (1) the age of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* beginning in the year 1429 B.C. and (2) the age of *observation* ending in the same year. According to him, all statements, regarding astronomical events from the earliest Vedic time (4,000 B.C.) downwards to about 1429 B.C. were very correct for they were based on correct *observations* only. If that be so, it must be admitted that the people of those times must have been very

---

16 We are agreeable to take up the question again if it is ever disputed—Writer.

accurate and skilful observers, and as they were doing this, for more than 2,500 years, they must have acquired sufficient knowledge in all astronomical matters. But Prof. Sen Gupta still wants us to take it that the people had no system of astronomy. The first system they had was what is known as the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* and that, in the year 1429 B.C. The necessary consequence of this (i.e. their being enriched with this treasure—The *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* according to Prof. Sen Gupta) was that the people at once forgot all that they had acquired for the last 2,500 years and that they gave up the habit of observation, lost all their skill in determining and recording astronomical events correctly. They now turned their attention solely to the pages of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* and had all their yearnings satisfied therein. But this is very hard to believe. We have already dealt with this question, and have seen that this assumption cannot hold, as his *theory of observation* is itself baseless.

Point (3). According to Prof. Sen Gupta nobody knew of solar months in the times of the *Mahābhārata*; they were not in existence. The months were then all lunar.

It is very hard to believe that these are the present views of Prof. Sen Gupta. He himself advocated the existence of solar months from the earliest Vedic times. Are we to understand that he gave up his earlier views simply to contradict me?

Lunar months are independent of the actual positions of the sun or of the moon. The period of time, in which the moon passes over a distance of 12°, with respect to the sun, is termed a tithi. 30 such tithis make a lunar month; this period is equal to about 29.53 days (civil). A lunar year consists of 12 lunar months and is of 354.367 days. If we are to believe Prof. Sen Gupta we are to accept the view that the people of the *Mahābhārata* times followed this year, the year of 354.367 days. Was it really so?

Solar months are dependent on the positions and the motions of the sun only. They are known to be in existence in India from the earliest Vedic times.

In all the Vedas, we have injunctions to perform sacrifices according to the seasons. The years, which depend on the seasons, are tropical and all tropical years are solar. Hence, the years in the Vedic times were all solar. Each season then consisted of two months, so that the whole year consisted of 12 solar months. The period in which the sun executed one complete revolution was considered to be a solar year. The ecliptic, even in Vedic times, was considered to be divided into 360°. The period of the sun's crossing each 30° was then considered to be the duration of each of the months. Hence, the months then were all solar. The names of these months, with the corresponding seasons have been given in all the Vedas. They are; Madhu, Mādhava, Śukra, Śuci, Nabhas, Nabhasya, Iśa, Urjja, Ṣaha, Sahasya, Tapas, and Tapasya. These months in the time of the *Mahābhārata*, began to be termed or used as synonymous with Caitra, Vaiśākha, Jyeṣṭha, Āṣāḍha, Śrāvaṇa, Bhādra, Āświna, Kārtika, Agrahāyaṇa, Pauṣa, Māgha and Phālguna, respectively.

Vyāsadeva, who subdivided the Vedas, must have known of it. So it is certain that the solar months were known in the time of the *Mahāvhāratā*.

If there were no solar months in use, in those times, the question of intercalary months would never have arisen at all. The term intercalation signifies the adjustment of the lunar months with the solar months. The Mohammedans do not follow the system of solar months, so they do not require intercalation of their months. But in India the system of intercalation can be traced to the very earliest times. This alone shows the existence of solar months in those times.

In *Mahābhārata* also we have evidences of the use of solar months amongst which may be mentioned the statement of Bhīṣma about the winter solstice day on the first day of the month of Māgha. It runs as follows [17] :—

परिवृत्तो हि भगवान् सहस्रांशुर्दिवाकरः
माघोऽयं समनुप्राप्तो मासः सौम्यो युधिष्ठिर।
त्रिभागशेषः पक्षोऽयं शुक्लो भवितुमर्हति।

In accordance with his assumption, that all months were lunar in those days Prof. Sen Gupta tried to interpret the above text as follows [18] :—

"The thousand rayed glorious sun has certainly turned month . . . . . The lunar month of Māgha is fully on and its three forths are over ; this ought to be the light half of the month."

He takes समनुप्राप्तः to mean 'fully advanced.' But the root आप् preceded by the prefix प्र signifies 'to reach', 'to attain' and not 'to advance'. The other prefixes सम् and अनु together give the sense of 'completely' or 'just.' The word सौम्य means lunar or चान्द्र. The latter part of the verse has three parts

(1) माघोऽयं समनुप्राप्तः (2) मासः सौम्यः त्रिभागशेषः (3) पक्षोऽयं शुक्लः

Hence, the translation of the text should be :—

"The great thousand rayed sun has indeed turned north. The solar month of Māgha has just begun. The three fourths of the lunar months are over. It is the bright half of the lunar month now."

The solar month of Māgha was synonymous with the Vedic month, Tapas, which always began with the winter solstice day. The day on which Bhīṣma died was also a winter solstice day. So it was rightly spoken of by Bhīṣma that the solar month of Māgha had just begun.

---

17 *Mahābhārata*, Anuśāsana Parva, Ch. 167 vol. 26-8.

18 *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 8.

That the Vedic months, Madhu, Mādhava etc., were all solar months, is quite known to Prof. Sen Gupta, as he himself used them as such in his celebrated work—"*The Ancient Indian Chronology*." On page 64 of this book, he takes the month of Māgha to begin with the sun's crossing 330° of the ecliptic. In the same way, he took the beginning of the month of Saha (Mārgaśīrṣa) to begin with 210° and on page 160 he takes the month Tapas or solar Māgha to begin with 270°. If these were not solar months, what were they?

In the statement of Bhīṣma, as quoted above, we have the word सौम्य: qualifying the word मास: signifying, the lunar month. Had there been no solar month in existence in the time of the *Mahābhārata* the use of सौम्य, as a qualifying adjective, would have been quite superfluous. It has been used, on purpose, to distinguish between the month (lunar) of which the three fourths were gone and the month (solar) which had just begun, with the solstitial passage of the sun.

The sidereal years are also solar years. The difference between a tropical (सायन) year and a sidereal (निरयन) year lies in the fact that in the former case, the sun's yearly revolution is considered to be completed by two successive passages of the sun through the same equinox or the same solstice and in the latter case the revolution is considered to be completed by two successive passages of the sun through the same point of the ecliptic. At the time of the *Mahābhārata* the tropical system was still prevailing, but later, the sidereal system was introduced with the first point of the nakṣatra Dhaniṣṭhā (β Delphini) marking the beginning of the year and also the beginning of the month of solar Māgha. In this case also, the period of the sun's passage through each 30° of space was considered to be the duration of each of the solar months. This system (Nirayana) continued up to the reign of the Guptas. After this, the

initial point was shifted to the first point of Aświnī, the then vernal equinox.

We fail to understand what has been aimed at, by Prof. Sen Gupta, by saying that there was no mention or enumeration of the zodiacal signs in the *Mahābhārata*. We also agree to the absence of the names of zodiacal signs in the *Mahābhārata*. We have never said anything contradictory to it. But his statement amounts to an implied allegation that I hold the opposite view. It seems likely that Prof. Sen Gupta expected that none of the readers would ever care to turn the pages of my paper to verify his statement nor would I ever have the impudence to reply to his rejoinder and that his indirect allegation would stand and that would create a permanent presumption in the mind of the readers against me.

Does this constitute a very clever pleading in favour of his case ?

In the paragraph marked as objection (I) by us, Prof. Sen Gupta gives us rules, which according to him must be followed by others. We have discussed them above. As the results thereof will be useful in following other objections, we sum them up below for ready reference :

(1) Under the head objection I, Prof. Sen Gupta gives us the necessary requisites for astronomical investigations into the ancient Indian history. He believes in the truth of the *Mahābhārata* statements, but considers them to have been derived from observations only and not by calculations based on some advanced system of astronomy. His view has been proved to be erroneous, as *observation* was impossible in many cases and future predictions were found to be impossible without calculations. So the existence of some fairly advanced system in those times must have to be assumed.

(2) His view, that scientific siddhāntas came into being, only in Āryabhatta's time, must have to be qualified.

(3) The view, that the age of the *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa* began from 1429 B.C. is wrong, has been proved.

(4) The solar months were known in the time of the *Mahābhārata* and also before it. His view that all months were lunar is wrong.

(5) There is no evidence in favour of the impression that in ancient times the term nakṣatra was used in the sense of " star " or " star group."

The results of investigations made by Prof. Sen Gupta must therefore be taken with caution.

Objection 2

Prof. Sen Gupta here finds fault with the statements of Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma and undertakes to correct them.

Before taking up the question, we have to make some preliminary remarks, explaining what these statements stood for and why it was felt necessary by Prof. Sen Gupta to have them corrected.

There are two kinds of astronomical events, given in the *Mahābhārata*. One set gives only the calendar events i.e. the order of tithis and nakṣatras for the year of the war and the other, the position of the then winter solstice with reference to the star Jyeṣṭhā.

If any two years, however distant from each other, have the same phase of the moon, occurring at the same point of the ecliptic, they would be similar to each other as regards their lunisolar aspects. Similar years may be had at intervals of about 19 years, 160 years, etc. In the year 2449 B.C., we have the conjunction of the sun with Jyeṣṭhā, at new moon. In the year of the war also, we have the same event, So the year 2449 B.C. is similar to the year of the war. But whether this year was the correct year of the war or not, will depend on the distance of the star Jyeṣṭhā from the winter solstice of the year.

According to the statements of Kṛsna and Bhīṣma, the distance of the winter solstice in the year of the war

from the star Jyeṣṭhā was 67 days' journey of the sun. But in the year 2449 B.C., it was 80 days' journey, as is apparent from the calculations given by Prof. Sen Gupta.[19]

As the solstice is continually moving backward, the distance between it and Jyeṣṭhā must be constantly changing. A particular distance, between them, represents a particular year. The distance of 67 days' journey and no other distance respresents the year of the war, according to the statements of Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma. As this distance was of 80 days' journey, in the year 2449 B.C., this date cannot be the same as what is indicated by the above two statements. Now we have to decide which of them is the true year of the Bhārata War.

Prof. Sen Gupta says: "The *Mahābhārata* references lead us directly, to the year 2449 B.C., as the year of the great battle."[20] But it does not appear to be the case. He himself admits to have borrowed his date from Varāhamihira.[21]

Varāha's statement as quoted by Prof. Sen Gupta :—

आसन् मघासु, मुनयः शासति पृथ्वीं युधिष्ठिरं नृपतौ।
षड् द्विक पंच द्वियुतः शककालस्तस्य राज्ञश्च ॥

His translation . . . . . . The seven Ṛṣis were in the Maghās when King Yudhiṣṭhira was reigning over the earth. His era is the era of the Śaka Kings to which 2526 have been added.

His comment on it . . . . . The first part of this statement has remained a riddle to all researchers up to the present time. The second part gives a most categorical statement that Yudhiṣṭhira became King in—2526 Śaka era which corresponds to 2449 B.C., the year of the war as given by Prof. Sen Gupta.

---

[19] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 17.
[20] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 59.
[21] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-5.

Prof. Sen Gupta is not the only person to follow Varāhamihira. He was anticipated several centuries ago, by the author of *Bhārata sāvitrī,* who also assumed the distance between Jyeṣṭhā and the then winter solstice as of 80 days' journey of the sun. His argument appears to be as the following . . . . . . The summer solstice (Saptarṣi) according to Varāha was at the star Maghā in the time of Yudhiṣṭhira. The distance from Maghā to Jyeṣṭhā was 100° and that from Maghā to winter solstice was 180°. Hence, the distance from Jyeṣṭhā to winter solstice was 80°. Taking 1° to be the daily motion of the sun, the sun would take about 80° days to move from Jyeṣṭhā to the then winter solstice. He then took the battle to begin just 67 days before the winter solstice day i.e. after 80-67 or 13 days from the amāvāsyā day and this is why he said :—

हेमन्ते प्रथमे मासि शुक्लपक्षे त्रयोदशीम् ।
प्रवृत्तं भारतं युद्धं नक्षत्रे यमदैवते ।।

Thus it is clear, that he took the amāvāsyā in Jyeṣṭhā from Kṛṣṇa's statement, winter solstice on Bhīṣma's day of expiry from Bhīṣma's statement, and the date of the beginning of the war from the statements of both. All this, therefore, presupposes the existence of the statements of both Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma, before the author of the *Bharata Sāvitrī* started his theory of the date of the Bhārata War. The theory advanced by the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* may be termed as *Bhārata Sāvitrī* tradition.

But the statements of Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma together form a different tradition and are capable, by themselves, of yielding a distinct date. So the Kṛṣṇa-Bhīṣma tradition is anterior to the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* tradition which is of quite a late date, coming even after Varāha (505 A.D.). Hence, the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* tradition must be considered as a later interpolation and therefore must be rejected.

It is likely, that the author of the *Bharata Sāvitri* did not attempt any change in the readings of the original *Mahābhārata*. But it is a fact that he interpolated additional matters into it. We have the following verse in Swargārohaṇa Parva :[22]

इमां भारतसावित्रीं प्रातरुत्थाय यः पठेत् ।
स भारतफलं प्राप्य परं ब्रह्माधिगच्छति ॥

This shows clearly that this chapter belongs to the *Bhārata Sāvitrī*. There may be similar other chapters in the *Mahābhārata*. If any such is ever met with, it must be rejected forthwith, as spurious. The commentator Nīlakaṇṭha was a supporter of the views of the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* and tried to interpret the statement of Baladeva, in a way, to support it. So for similar reason, his interpretation must have to be rejected.

Prof. Sen Gupta has practically followed the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* and accepted the view, with some improvements. The author of the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* did not care to see how his view would affect the original evidences, in the *Mahābhārata*. His results appear to have been obtained from calculations, following the *Sūryya-Siddhānta*. The tithi, according to this, on the first day of the war, was *Śukla 13th followed by 14th* as pointed out by Nīlakaṇṭha by saying त्रयोदशीशब्देन चतुर्दश्येव ग्राह्या. The end of the war, according to the view, took place on Śukla 1st, in the nakṣatra Uttarāṣāḍha and Bhīṣma expired on the winter solstice day on the tithi Kṛṣṇa 6th.

But Prof. Sen Gupta was not quite satisfied with this result. It is interesting to follow him. He wanted to have his results, as close as possible, to the statements of Bhīsma, Kṛṣṇa, Baladeva and Vyāsa. He therefore, shifted forward by a day, the day of the beginning and end of the war and also that of Bhīṣma's expiry. According to

[22] Swargārohaṇa-Parva, Ch. 5, Vol. 65.

Bhīsma he died on the latter part of Sukla 8th. Prof. Sen Gupta got Kṛṣṇa 8th to begin at about 6 P.M. on this day though it was the day following the winter solstice day. By this change, he got nakṣatra Śravaṇā also on the last day of the battle, though it was then Śukla 2nd. Thus it came to be now in agreement with Baladeva's statement. Vyasa said that he saw the full moon of Kārtika. By this change, Prof. Sen Gupta, could make it Śukla 14th, which according to him, was an anumati Pūrnīmā, though it made the month to be Agrahāyaṇa instead of Kārtika as required. Now we shall be in a position to understand his real intentions and requirements and how he would have them effected.

Prof. Sen Gupta first takes up the statement of Bhīṣma. He wants to have the tithi in it, to be transformed into Kṛṣṇa 8th. He begins by saying ......" Prof. Bhattacharya, in his paper makes capital of this last statement and its last line त्रिभागशेष: पक्षोऽयं शुक्लो भवितुमर्हति or that the half lunar month should be (or should have been) the light half. If Bhīṣma's last line of utterance had been— त्रिभागशेष: पक्षोऽयं शुक्ल एव न संशय: none could take it to mean otherwise. There is evidently reason to doubt the *faith* expressed in the utterance. As researchers, we are to look for truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth." Prof. Sen Gupta's point is very ably and clearly put. He considers that Bhīṣma's statement is dubious ; for, it betrays faith, doubt, hesitation or indecision on the part of Bhīṣma, as he used the words शुक्लो भवितुमर्हति instead of शुक्ल एव न संशय: So he (Prof. Sen Gupta) considers himself free to take it to mean कृष्ण एव न संशय: as he did actually. So it is apparent that he considers that the real intention of Bhīṣma was to say कृष्णो भवितुमर्हति, but somehow or other the reverse i.e. the word शुक्ल escaped inadvertently out of him.

Thus it appears that his whole case hangs by a single thread, the correct meaning of the word अर्हति. Let us examine it a little more carefully. Prof. Sen Gupta

takes the root अर्ह् to mean 'to be possible', whereas its correct meaning is ' to be fit.' In the statement of Bhīṣma, it means 'to be fit' and not 'to be probable'. शुक्लो भवितुमर्हति is an assertive sentence and not a problematic one. The form, in which it is given, is a standard and well-recognised one, for idiomatic indicative assertion. It is rather a polite, modest and dignified way of expressing oneself. It does not convey any idea of probability or faith. To clarify this, a few sentences from the *Mahābhārata* and *Śrīmad Bhagavad-Gītā* are given below:

(1) प्रव्राजनं च नगरादजिनैश्च विवासनम्।
महारण्यनिवासश्च न तस्य स्मर्तुमर्हसि ।।[20]

Bhīma retorts Yudhiṣṭhira by asking him "Does it not befit you to remember our being driven out of the city in deer skins, the exile and the living in the forest?"

(2) त्वंहि नः परमो वक्ता लोकेऽस्मिन् भरतर्षभ।
एतद् भवन्तं पृच्छामि तन्मे त्वं वक्तुमर्हसि ।।[24]

"O the greatest of the Bharatas, you are the greatest of our speakers in the world. I ask you this. It befits you to speak to me."

This was spoken by Yudhiṣṭhira to Bhīṣma.

(3) जातस्य हि ध्रुवो मृत्युः ध्रुवं जन्म मृतस्य च।
तस्मादपरिहार्य्येऽर्थे न त्वं शोचितुमर्हसि।। [25]

Translation . . . . . The death of the living being is sure; so also the rebirth of the dead; so it does not befit you to grieve for what is inevitable.

It was spoken to Arjuna by Śrī Kṛṣṇa.

(4) अविनाशि तु तद् विद्धि येन सर्वमिदं कृतम्।
विनाशमव्ययस्यास्य न कश्चित् कर्तुमर्हसि ।।[26]

---

[23] Śānti Parva (*Mahābhārata*), Ch. 16, Vol. 9.
[24] *Ibid*, ,, ,, Ch. 227, Vol. 2.
[25] *Śrīmad Bhagavad-Gītā*, Ch. 2, Verse 27.
Ch. 2, Verse 17.

Translation . . . . . Know that, by whom all this has been created, to be immortal. It does not befit any one (i.e. no one is fit) to destroy the indestructible. It was said By Kṛṣṇa to Arjuna.

Innumerable instances as above, showing uses of the root 'अर्ह्' can be obtained from almost all standard works in Sanskrit.

There is not the slightest sign of dubiousness or indecision in all the above extracts. They all convey the idea of fullest confidence on the part of the speakers concerned, as to what they meant to say. So it is evident that Prof. Sen Gupta has been mistaken in assuming that the word अर्हति in Bhīṣma's statement expressed dubiousness, faith, or probability on the part of Bhīṣma. It expressed rather fullest conviction of Bhīṣma as to the tithi being Śukla 8th on the date of his expiry and to other tithi or pakṣa. Thus it is proved conclusively that शुक्लो भवितुमर्हति and स शुक्ल एव न संशयः mean the same identical fact, that the Pakṣa on the last day of Bhīṣma was undoubtedly Śukla and not Kṛṣṇa, as Prof. Sen Gupta would have it.

Assuming Prof. Sen Gupta to have successfully transformed Śukla to Kṛṣṇa, there still remain other difficulties to be solved. In his year (2449 B.C.) the tithi on the winter solstice day was Kṛṣṇa 6th. According to Bhīṣma's statement he died on the winter solstice day and that in the latter half of Śukla 8th. As Prof. Sen Gupta cannot allow Bhīṣma to die on the 6th tithi, he fixed the next day, i.e., the day after the winter solstice day, on which the tithi was the Kṛṣṇa 7th ; but the tithi Kṛṣṇā 8th began in the evening of the same day. Even this did not satisfy the exact requirement but he himself was satisfied with it.

This supplies us with an instance how Prof. Sen Gupta was following the *Mahābhārata alone* and seeking for *the truth and the whole truth*.

But we do not understand why Prof. Sen Gupta took so much trouble in disproving Bhiṣma's statement and trying to get it reconciled to his requirements. It would have been more sensible for him to reject the statement, as being perfectly unreliable and seek for other evidences. He should have honestly and openly declared that he followed the more reliable authority, Varāha Mihira for his date of the Bharata war and not the *Mahābhārata*.

Next he turns to Kṛṣṇa's statement which says that the war began on the day of the new moon, in the nakṣatra Jyeṣṭhā. Prof. Sen Gupta says "Prof. Bhattacharyya would make us believe that the great fight began on the newmoon day itself. Kṛṣṇa's utterance is an important one no doubt ; but it cannot give us the real date, on which the great fight began. There are very potent reasons in support of my contention" But we have not yet been supplied with any.

Here also Prof. Sen Gupta could not accept the statement as a whole. He proposes to accept one part of it and reject the other, so that it may come to conform with the requirement of his date, which was preconceived and derived from a source foreign to the *Mahābhārata*. He ought to have rejected this statement also instead of mutilating it. That would have been wiser.

Some other scholar may also follow him in accepting arbitrarily any other date for his year of the Bhārata War and *partly* accept and *partly* reject the given *Mahābhārata* statements to suit the requirement for his particular year. He also may argue in the same way as has been done by Professor Sen Gupta. Then there would be no end of the dates for the Bhārata War.

The learned Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane very aptly remarks on this attitude of some scholars saying[27] "If we can

[27] *History of Dharma Śāstra*, by Mm. Dr. P. V. Kane, Vol. III, Ch. XXXIV, p. 912.

once concede that we are at liberty to change readings to suit our theory even in the total absence of all manuscript evidences, then there is no sure foundation on which we can build. The *Mahābhārata* passages have a tradition of centuries behind them. We must in the absence of good Mss evidences to the contrary, either accept them all or try to explain them or we must give up the job of reconciling them as a hopeless tangle and rely on other evidences to arrive at the date of the Bhārata War, as best as we can."

As to the alleged postponement of the date of the Bhārata War from amāvāsyā to the next 14th Sukla the pertinent remarks thereon by Dr. K.L. Daftari[28] are worth quoting. He says " It is certain from सप्तमाच्चापि etc, that it was proposed to begin the war on the amāvāsyā of Kārtika. If the war was not started on the proposed day the author of the *Mahābhārata* must have known that fact and in that case he could not have failed to mention it especially, because he would have seen that such a statement as सप्तमाच्चापि etc, by itself, without a statement about the postponement of the war, would have the tendency to mislead the reader. He would therefore, have expressly mentioned the postponement of the war and the cause thereof. But it is a fact that he has never mentioned the postponement of the war nor the cause of the same. It follows therefore, that the war was not postponed. Moreover, in giving the statement सप्तमाच्चापि etc, the auther cannot be supposed to have had any intention other than that of stating the day on which war began and it is significant that the statement has not been contradicted any where."

Besides, by retaining the statement of Bhısma, in the *Mahābharata*, as to tithi (Sukla 8th) on the date of his (Bhīṣma's) expiry, Vyāsadeva, the author, supported the fact,

[28] *The astronomical method and its application to the chronology of Ancient India.* by Dr. K. L. Daftari, p. 125.

that the war really began on the stated day i.e. amāvāsyā in Jyeṣṭhā; for, the tithi Śukla 8th, on the day of expiry of Bhīṣma, implies the fact, that the tithi just 67 days before this date, (the date which has also been admitted by Prof. Sen Gupta as the first day of the war) must be an amāvāsyā day.

So it is proved, beyond doubt, that the war was not postponed.

Bhīṣma's statement supplies us with another important information. According to the statement, the three fourths of the lunar month ended on the Śukla 8th. From this it follows, that the full month ended on the next Pūrṇimā i.e. the lunar months were then full-moon ending and not new-moon ending.

Objection III (pp. 206-7)

It is a criticism of the statement of Vyāsadeva directly, with personal reflections on me. Prof. Sen Gupta tries to clear up his position as to the source, from which he got the reading अलक्षे प्रभया हीनां etc.[29] He says that he himself found this reading in the B. O. R. I. edition of the *Mahābhārata* itself. With due respect to him I beg to submit that he has not looked into the pages of the above edition *himself*, but must have been supplied with the information by one of his friends who we fear has positively misled him. He can have it from me that the reading in B. O. R. I. edition is अलक्षः प्रभया हीन etc.[30] as may be veri-

---

[29] Text accepted by Prof. Sen Gupta

अ।लक्षे प्रभया हीनां पौर्णमासीं च कार्तिकीम्।
चन्द्रोभूदग्निवर्णश्च समवर्णो नभस्तले।।

Translat'on by Prof. Sen Gupta :– To-night I find the full moon at Krittikā (Plediades) lustreless the moon became of a fire colour in a lotus hued heaven.

[30] The standard version (in B. O. R. I.).

अलक्षः प्रभया हीनः पौर्णमासीं च कार्तिकीम्।
चन्द्रोभूदग्निवर्णश्च पद्मवर्णो नभस्तले।।

Translation :—The full moon in the month (or in nakṣatra) Kṛttikā became fire coloured and lustreless in the lotus coloured sky.

fied by any one. The edition is available in all respectable libraries in most of the big cities. In the foot-note, of course, there have been given several different readings, amongst which आलक्षं etc. also appears as one. But it is a fact that the reading अलक्षः etc. is the most widely known reading. But this is practically of little importance.

It must always be remembered, when discussing evidences, from the *Mahābhārata*, that we do not get the statements of Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa, Baladeva, and others, directly from themselves, but from the accounts as recorded by Vyāsadeva, in the *Mahābhārata*. Vyāsadeva was writing the history of the Pāṇḍavas and Kauravas. He included in his writing the details of only those events which he knew to be true and which are consistent with one another. It is not known, if he (Vyāsa) quoted the statements of others *verbatim*. It is quite possible that he put down what they had said, in his own words, keeping always, in tact, the spirit and the intention of the respective speakers. Thus it appears that the statements of Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa and others come virtually to belong to Vyāsadeva himself ultimately. So it does not seem probable that he himself would make any statement that might contradict the other statements, recorded by himself as true. If he did so, he would have proved himself to be unreliable with the consequence, that his work the *Mahābhārata* itself would have proved to be unreliable and in that case it would have lost all its worth as evidence.

Prof. Sen Gupta requires the support of the *Mahābhārata* to establish his date. If the *Mahābhārata* itself is found to be unreliable he would be left in the wilderness. By trying to prove that Vyāsa's statement was contradictory to those of Kṛṣṇa and Bhisma he (Prof. Sen Gupta) is going to disprove the authenticity of the *Mahābhārata* and thus striking at the very root of his very support. But fortunately, he has not been successful in his attempt, as we shall see presently.

We shall follow now the results of the calculation, as given by Prof. Sen Gupta. According to the statement, Vyāsadeva saw the *full moon* in the month of lunar Kārtika. It was the 3rd November 2449 B.C., when, according to Prof. Sen Gupta, Vyāsadeva looked at the moon. Calculations show that it was the 14th tithi of the bright half. For 161° 30′ 12°= 13.417 tithi, at 5h 8m P.M., at Kurukṣetra. The 14th tithi completed after sunrise on the next day. It was therefore, not a Pūrṇimā at all. He says it was Anumati Pūrṇimā. This is also wrong. Anumati Pūrṇimā is that Pūrṇimā which is preceded by the 14th tithi in the earlier part of the civil day, in which it happens to fall, and ends on the Pūrṇimā in the latter half. But on the 3rd November the day began with the 13th tithi and ended on the 14th. This has been admitted by Professor Sen Gupta himself, in his adaptation of the verse of the *Bhārata-Sāvitrī*. The verse of the *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* has already been given. The adaptation[31] is as follows :

हेमन्ते प्रथमे मासि शुक्लपक्षे चतुर्दशीम् ।
प्रवृत्तं भारतं युद्धं नक्षत्रे ब्रह्मदैवते ॥

That is, the war began on the 14th tithi (bright), in the nakṣatra Rohiṇī, in the month of Mārgaśīrṣa (the first month of the season Hemanta). The war then began on the 14th tithi. The previous night, in which Vyāsa is said to have seen the moon, therefore can, in no case, be the Anumati Pūrnimā, as claimed by him.

By Kārtikī P.ūrnamāsī, Prof. Sen Gupta prefers to take that night, in which the moon was in advance of the star group Pleiades, by more than 6° at sun-set. May we ask by what reason ? He has never answered this question, anywhere. In fact, he has no reason to support this view, which is against all traditions.

---

[31] *Rejoinder*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 207.

The standard meaning of the term Kārtikī Paurṇamāsī is the Purnimā, in the month of lunar Kārtika. If the nakṣatra, in which the full moon then was, had been specified, we could have taken it to mean Purṇima in the nakṣatra Kṛttikā. We shall try to see, if the month on the 3rd November can by any stretch of imagination be made to be transformed into the lunar month of Kārtika. Prof. Sen Gupta himself says,[32] "Before the battle broke out, there was a new moon near the star Antares (Jyesṭha), from which the lunar month of *Agrahāyaṇa* began in the year." So after 14 days from this new moon, the lunar month of Agrahayaṇa was still continuing. Hence, it was the month of Agrahāyaṇa in which Vyāsa observed the full moon as urged and not in the month of Kārtika as was required by Vyāsa's statement.

If we take the meaning of the Kārtikī to mean 'in the naksatra Kṛttikā,' then the meaning of the Kārtikī Pūrṇima comes to be, that Pūrṇimā that occurred in the nakṣatra Kṛttikā. But this was also not possible, for the position of the moon as given by Prof. Sen Gupta shows that she was then in the nakṣatra Rohiṇī and not in Kṛttikā.

This is why he could not take any of the standard meanings of Kārtikī Pūrṇimā and took to an arbitrary meaning, i.e., beyond the star Pleiades by 5°. He did not give any reason for this unusual assumption and expected the reader to accept him, on his own personal authority. If he had given any reasons for this queer assumption of his, we might have been in a position to try to meet them; but as there is none, we are helpless.

Let us try to see what these results lead us to. We have already seen that, according to the statements of Bhīsma and Kṛṣṇa, the first day of the war ought to have fallen on the amāvāsyā day. By retaining these in the

---

[32] *Ancient Indian Chronology*, by P. C. Sen Gupta, p. 20.

Mahābhārata, Vyāsa acceded to their truth. If we now assume that he agreed also to the war having begun 14 days later, he would be contradicting himself.

In his own statement Vyāsadeva says that he saw the moon, in the night of the Kārtikī Pūrṇimā. But, according to Prof. Sen Gupta he (Vyāsadeva) saw her in the night of the 14th tithi in the month of Agrahāyaṇa. If we accept this view, we have to accept as well, that Vyāsa, the author of the *Mahābhārata* and the greatest sage of the time, was not competent enough to distinguish the lunar month of Kārtika from that of Agrahāyaṇa and the full moon from the moon of the 14th tithi. From this then it would naturally follow that the man Vyāsa could not be considered as reliable in what he might have said.

Now the question may be raised, was there really any full moon having occurred either in the month of Kārtika or in the nakṣatra Kṛttikā, in the year of the Bhārata war? Yes, there was. It occurred just 15 days before the amāvāsyā day. In the year of Prof. Sen Gupta (2449 B.C.) also, which was similar to the correct year of the *Bhārata* war, there took place a full moon in the month of Kārtika and that in the nakṣatra Kṛttikā also. This was on the 6th October. But the tithi (full moon) expired in the day time at about 3 P.M. and did not extend into the night, as is apparently required by the statement i.e. in the correct year of war the full moon in question must have extended into the night. This gives another reason for disbelieving the year 2449 B.C. as the correct year of the Bhārata war, as claimed by Prof. Sen Gupta.

Thus it is proved beyond doubt that Vyāsadeva could not have observed the full moon on the day as proposed by Prof. Sen Gupta. He (Prof. Sen Gupta) accepted the reading of the statement of Vyāsa, beginning with अलक्षे in preference to the standard and most commonly recognised reading, beginning with the word अलक्ष्यः. The

reason is quite clear. The *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* which Prof. Sen Gupta follows, wanted the statement to mean that it was said by Vyāsa to Dhṛtarāṣṭra, just when he was in the act of observing the moon. For आलक्षे having been used in लट् (present tense) signifies action in the present. But it is inconsistent with the sense given by the word अभूत् (in the second line) which distinctly signifies a past action having been used in लुङ्. But all this is of no conseque-nce. For, even if we accept this interpretation, the result would be simply to prove that Vyāsa was unreliable, as we have already explained.

So the statement of Vyāsadeva stands, as those of Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma, and there seems to be no sense in assuming that the war had to be postponed.

Objection IV (pp. 208-209)

Prof. Sen Gupta gives the statement of Balarāma with his translation, and remarks "clearly then, the last day of the battle was a Śrāvaṇa day."

And then he falls on me with his charges as follows:—

(a) "Prof. Bhattacharyya does the climax of his performance when he would transpose or interchange and read the 2nd line as श्रवणे संप्रयातोऽस्मि पुष्येण पुनरागतः to suit his purpose.

(b) "This is considered inadmissible by all Sanskritists. According to one of them, the natural meaning of the stanza, which is very clear, should never be destroyed by this sort of transposition.

(c) "Prof. Bhattacharyya's contention, that Balarāma returned on the Puṣya day is thus totally wrong.

(d) "He is here destroying a *Mahābhārata* statement, as it explodes root and branch of the thesis of his."

Here we have all his very learned and valuable arguments against my interpretation.

The portions marked by (a) and (b) give us the premises of his argument, (c) is the conclusion and (d) is the corollary to the conclusion.

In (a) Prof. Sen Gupta charges me of transposition of words in Baladeva's statement. My answer to it is that it is not true and that I deny the charge. I considered the interpretation of Nīlakantha to be incorrect, for reasons already given. So I tried to give, with reasons, another interpretation, which I thought to be correct. Prof. Sen Gupta favours Nīlakaṇṭha's interpretation. If he liked he could have met my arguments, point by point, with his and thus might have refuted me completely and thereby established his own point of view, permanently. Instead of this, he accused me wrongly and there he stops. Does he think that only bringing a charge against any one is enough to prove the guilt ?

In (b) he says that some one considers that I should not have done as I did. We are curious to know who that 'some one' is. Is he Prof. Sen Gupta himself ? This is the second premise of his argument. Very sound indeed!

In (c) he comes to the conclusion that Prof. Bhattacharyya's contention, that Baladeva returned on the Puṣya day, is *thus* totally wrong. Beautiful !!

In (d) he concludes by saying "He (Bhattacharyya) is here destroying a *Mahābhārata* statement as it explodes root and branch of the thesis of his paper". As an answer to this, we may only say this, that Prof. Bhattacharyya will always remain grateful to him for his wishful statement. As to the destruction of the *Mahābhārata* statements, we may say that we are rather endeavouring to stand against their being destroyed by unscrupulous vandalism.

We beg to remind the reader that we have already dealt with the two traditions relating to the date of the Bharata war. We may be permitted to mention them over again here. One of the traditions has been named by us the *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* tradition. It came into being between the 6th and 16th century A.D. The other, we have named as the Kṛṣṇa-Bhīṣma tradition, for, it was based on the

statements of Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma, as they actually are in the *Mahābhārata*. As these statements are in perfect agreement with the statement of Vyāsadeva, the author of the great work the *Mahābhārata*, they may be considered to belong to the original *Mahabhārata* and to represent the correct and original tradition as to the date of the Bhārata war and other matters in connection therewith.

In order that an astronomical event might belong to the original *Māhbahārata* and be fit for being used as evidence, it should be consistent with, and not contrary to, the Kṛṣṇa-Bhīṣma tradition. If it goes contrary to the Kṛṣṇa and Bhīṣma tradition (statements), it must be considered as spurious.

We have found that the interpretation given to the statement of Baladeva by Nīlakaṇṭha was contradictory to the Kṛṣṇa-Bhīṣma traditions and favourable to the *Bhārata Sāvitrī* tradition. Even leaving apart the question of the two traditions, we would see that Nīlakaṇṭha's interpretation was anomalous in itself. Baladeva's statement runs as follows :—

चत्वारिंशदशान्यद्य द्वे च मे निःसृतस्य वै ।
पुष्येण संप्रयातोस्मि श्रवणे पुनरागतः ॥

Prof. Sen Gupta's translation following Nīlakaṇṭha is :—

"Since I started, today is 40 days and 2 more. I went away with the moon at Puṣya and have returned with the moon at Śravaṇā (Altair)."

So, on the last day of the war, it was the forty second day of his pilgrimage after his departure (from Dwārakā), according to this interpretation; Baladeva started on a Puṣya day and reached Kurukṣetra, on the last day of the war on Sravaṇā.

It may be here pointed out, that there are other statements in connection with Baladeva's pilgrimage. Whatever might be the interpretation, it should be consistent

with the other statements as well. Of these other statements we may quote the following :—

एयमुक्ता महाबाहुरनुज्ञातश्च पाण्डवैः ।
तीर्थयात्रां ययौ रामः निर्वृत्य मधुसूदनः ॥

Translation: Saying this, Baladeva went out on pilgrimage after persuading Kṛṣṇa to return.

रौहिणेये गते शूरे पुष्येण मधुसूदनः ।
पाण्डवेयान् पुरस्कृत्य ययावभिमुखं कुरून् ॥[33]

Translation : After Rauhiṇeya (Baladeva) departed from Pāṇḍavas in Puṣya, Kṛṣṇa went to the Kauravas.

From these two extracts we find that during the period of his pilgrimage (and on his way to the Saraswatī) Baladeva met the Pāṇḍavas, at Kurukṣetra, on a Puṣya day before the war. This Puṣya day must be different from that on which he started from Dwārakā. So there must have passed at least 27 days from his start, to this meeting with the Pāṇḍavas. There was a Śravaṇā, after 14 days of this meeting. But then, the war has not yet begun, according to Nīlakaṇṭha. It ended 27 days later. Hence, the total number of days from start to the end of the war is 27+14+27=68 days. So it is clear that Baladeva could not have started on Puṣya. Neither Nīlakanthā nor Prof. Sen Gupta solved this anomaly.

According to our explanation, Baladeva started from Dwārakā on Śravaṇā. After 14 days from start, he met with the Pāṇḍavas at Kurukṣetra on a Puṣya and on the next Puṣya, 27 days later, he met them again on the last day of the war. It was thus the 42nd day (=14+28) from his departure from Dwārakā.

The interpretation given by Nīlakaṇṭha, therefore, does not hold. So we had to reject it. We refer the rea-

---

[33] महाभारत, उद्योगपर्व अ० १५७

der to our paper[34] and see for themselves how we tried to get the true interpretation out of it.

Prof. Sen Gupta follows Varāha-Mihira and the *Bhārata Sāvitrī*. So he considered the interpretation by Nīlakaṇṭha to be correct as it was in his favour and this is why he got so much enraged over our rejecting the same.

Objection V (Page 207)

Here Prof. Sen Gupta complains that I ignored the statement about the crescent moon rising before dawn in the night following the 14th day of the fight. Yes, I did it; for, such an event was not possible. According to the Kṛṣṇa-Bhīṣma tradition which belonged to the original *Mahābhārata*, the night in question belonged to the bright half and not to the dark half. The crescent moon in this night just suits the *Bhārata Sāvitri* tradition and goes against the correct one. Hence it had to be rejected as has been explained fully before; it does not require further elucidation.

It may be noted in this connection that the statements of Kṛṣṇa, Bhīṣma, Vyāsa and Baladeva are very terse and to the point. But to say that the night belonged to the dark half with the rise of the crescent moon before dawn, it was felt necessary to devote full three chapters (Droṇa Parva chapters 183-5) containing more than 150 verses. This shows that the author of these chapters was not confident himself as to what he was ṣaying and as to how they will be taken by the readers. But unlike this, the statements of Vyāsa, Bhīṣma, Kṛṣṇa etc. show full confidence on the part of the respective speakers, as to what they said. It may be known to most of the readers that the original *Mahābhārata*, as was composed by Vyāsadeva, contained only 8000 verses. They would require not more than 150 pages of a book, Royal 8vo. size, to be printed. It was

---

[34] *Date of Bhārata War*, by author, pp. 29—34, 70-71.

indeed a small book and Vyāsadeva could not indulge in long descriptions for any of the events. So it is easy to infer that the above chapters came from some hand other than that of Vyāsadeva and do not belong to the original *Mahābhārata*.

Objection VI (210-1)

On page 17 of my paper, I gave an analysis of the statements of Bhīṣma and Kṛṣṇa showing the chronological sequences of events from the beginning of the war to the expiry of Bhīsma. These statements constitute what we have named as Kṛṣṇa-Bhīsma tradition or the original *Mahābhārata* tradition. They represent a particular year, and with data for the same, Prof. Sen Gupta quotes them here. He considers them to be my personal views and complains that I tried to destroy his views with these. He is mistaken. The data given, do not belong to me. They belong to Bhīṣma and Kṛṣṇa and finally to Vyāsadeva, or it may be said that they belong to the original *Mahābhārata*. Prof. Sen Gupta wants to prove them to be wrong. He thinks that by doing so, he would prove me personally to be in the wrong and thus establish himself. We have already treated this question at some length and shown that the disproving the Krsna-Bhīsma statements would be the same as disproving the authenticity of the *Mahābhārata* itself.

The statements or the data implied therein are there in the *Mahābhārata*. I simply tried to use them to determine the date of the Bhārata war with their help.

In trying to disprove Yudhiṣṭhira and Bhīṣma, he uses the same old plea, of the determination of the time of solstitial passage by *observation* only. He says that it was not possible for them to determine it correctly, for, that was a question of time. But we have already disproved the assumption of his, at the very beginning of this reply. The people of those times depended on the almanacs calculated

by astronomers of the time. The results were fairly correct and were based on fairly advanced system of Astronomy. So Yudhiṣṭhira or Bhīṣma had no need of personally observing the astronomical phenomena, before making their statements.

As Prof. Sen Gupta followed the *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* tradition, his result must necessarily be different from ours; for, we followed a completely different tradition. As the *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* tradition is wrong, the result derived therefrom must of necessity be wrong.

Objection VII (pp. 211)

Prrof. Sen Gupta finds defect in our calculation of the sun's longitude for 10th March 1431 B.C. My value for this is 335° 44 27". I have worked it out again and found it to be correct. There is however a printing mistake just in the third line from it (above) giving the date as 8th March; it should be 10th March. Just in the 9th line further above the correct date i.e. 10th March has been shown.

Objection VIII (pp. 211)

Professor Sen Gupta complains that I made use of the evidences collected by him only, without acknowledging him. It is a wrong impression. They were used several centuries ago by commentator Nīlakaṇṭha and *Bhārata-Sāvitrī* and in the present by several others before him.

Objection IX (pp. 211-2)

At the very outset of this reply I pointed out that my object was to use the *Mahabharata* evidences only and not the external ones. That is why I did not think it necessary to meddle with the question of yugas. So the question about Yugas, as raised by Prof. Sen Gupta, is irrelevant to my case.

Objection X (pp. 213)

From my stand-point, Mohenzodaro and Harappa are also irrelevant matters. Besides, there has not yet been found any material which might throw any light as to the relation between Mohenzodaro and Harappa civilisation and the date of the Bhārata War. At least Prof. Sen Gupta had nothing to say on this question. So his simply referring to them is quite meaningless and he proves nothing thereby.

Year 2449 *B.C : its source and nature.*

We propose here to make a short study of the source and the nature of Yudhiṣṭhira's year (2526) corresponding to O (zero) Śaka year or 78 A.D. as supplied to us by Varāha Mihira. The tradition represented by him is known from the following extracts, which belong to the chapter XIII (on Saptarṣi Cāra i.e. motion of the saptarṣis).

(1) Statement of Vṛddha-Gārga :—

कलिद्वापरसन्धौ तु स्थितास्ते पितृदैवतम्[35]

Translation :—The Saptarṣis were in the nakṣatra Maghā at the junction of Kali and Dwāpara (when Yudhiṣṭhira reigned).

आसन् मघासु मुनयः शासति पृथ्वीं युधिष्ठिरे नृपतौ ।
षड्द्विकपंचद्वियुतः शककालस्तस्य राज्ञश्च ॥[36]

Translation :—The Munis (Saptarṣis) were in the nakṣatra Maghā when Yudhiṣṭhira reigned. The year of Yudhiṣṭhira's era is equal to 2526 Śaka year.

एकैकस्मिन् शतं शतं ते चरन्ति वर्षाणाम्[37]

Translation :—The Saptarṣis stay for 100 years in each of the nakṣatras.

---

35 *Bṛhat Saṃhitā*, by Varāha-Mihira, Ch. XIII. 2
36 *Ibid*, Ch. XIII. 3
37 *Ibid*, Ch. XIII. 4

The above statements supply us with rules to enable us to determine—

(1) the nakṣatra, in which the Saptarṣis might be situated in a given year (expressed in Śaka years).

(2) the time in Yudhiṣṭhira's year, when the Saptarṣis might be situated in any given nakṣatra.

The epoch of Yudhiṣṭhira's year may be taken to be the same as the date of the Bhārata War or the date of the birth of Parikṣit.

From the *Bṛhat-Saṁhitā*, it appears that, for the purpose of calculation, the following two assumptions also have to be made viz.

(1) The Saptarṣis must have to be considered to be situated just at the end of the nakṣatra Maghā at the epoch of the Yudhiṣṭhira era.

(2) The Saptarṣis always move in the forward direction i.e. towards the east.

Armed with these assumptions and rules, we may now calculate the nakṣatra in which Saptarṣis might he situated at any given time and also the time in Yudhiṣṭhira's year if the nakṣatra, corresponding to the time, is given.

The rule may be expressed mathematically as follows—

Let Y be the number of years (Yudhiṣṭhira) and N the number representing nakṣatra in which Saptarṣis might be present at the time Y, then

$$Y = 100\ N$$

Let us take the following examples—

(1) To find out the nakṣatra corresponding to Yudhiṣṭhira-year 2526.

$$2526 = 100\ N$$

$$\therefore N \quad \frac{2526}{100} = 25\frac{26}{100}$$

If we count forward from Maghā (taken as O), 25 nakṣatras will be completed with Puṣya. Hence the Saptarṣis

at the given time, were in the nakṣatra Aśleṣa, in which they have already passed 26 years.

(2) To find out the year when the Saptarṣis are in the nakṣatra Aślesā and have passed 26 years there. Here

$$N = \frac{2526}{100}$$

$$Y = 100 \times \frac{2526}{100} = 2526$$

Thus we see, if the Saptarṣis are assumed to be situated at a distance of 25 $\frac{26}{100}$ naksatras from the nakṣatra Maghā in Saka year O (zero) the Yudhiṣṭhira's year corresponding to O Śaka year would be 2526.

We, therefore, understand the grounds, on which the 2526 (Yudhiṣṭhira year) is based. From this year, the time of Yudhiṣṭhira, in Christian era, has been determined . . .

2526 Yudhiṣṭhira year = O Saka year

= 78 A.D.

∴ O Yudhisthira year = 78-2526 A.D. = - 2448 A.D.

= 2449 B.C.

It may be noted here that Varāha did not claim the authorship of this date nor did he believe that the true position of the solstice would be determined by this method. According to the above method, the position of the northern solstice in his time should have been in Hasta. But he knew that it was then near the star Punarvasu [38]

The data underlying this date 2449 B.C. may be given as below.

(1) Wrong assumption of the position of northern solstice (Saptarṣi), at the beginning of the 2nd quarter of Aśleṣā, in 78 A.D.

---

[33] *Pañca Siddhantika*, by Varāha-Mihira, Ch. 3, Vol. 21.

(2) Wrong assumption of the rate of motion of the solstice.

(3) Wrong assumption of the directions of motion of the solstice.

(4) Wrong assumption of the position of the northern solstice in the time of Yudhisthira. The correct position of the northern solstice at the time has been given in the statements of Bhīṣma and Kṛṣṇa. It was a point just 12° 17′ to the west of the star Maghā.

Thus it is evident that the year 2449 B.C. is based on all possible absurdities and impossibilities and Prof. Sen Gupta has accepted this date as the most correct one. The facts speak for themselves and we have nothing more to add.

We hope we have now met all the relevant objections, raised by Prof. Sen Gupta, with reasons and leave the decision to the reader.

PHILOSOPHY OF GAUḌAPĀDA (ALĀTAŚĀNTI-PRAKARAṆAṀ)

By JNANENDRALAL MAJUMDAR

(Continued from Vol. VIII Part 3, p. 233)

" WHEN it is not recognised that all things rise from the discrimination of Mind itself, discrimination asserts itself. When this is understood discrimination ceases. "[1] Transcendental knowledge is revealed when the particulars constituting the world are not considered as real and attached to as such but are considered as the Mind itself, free from the particularistic dualism of existence and non-existence, being and non-being. " (The Buddhist doctrine is this.) Mahāmati, when a (psychological) revulsion takes place in the Yogins (by the transcendence) of the Citta, Manas and Vijñāna, they cast off the (dualistic) discrimination of grasped and grasping in what is seen of Mind itself, and entering the Tathāgatagarbha attain the realisation of noble wisdom ; and in this there is no thought of existence and non-existence ".[2]

" That (transcendental) knowledge is unobtainable is due to the recognition that there is nothing in the world but what is seen of the Mind, and that these external objects to which being and non-being are predicated are non-existent".[3] " Mahāmati, the self-nature of things is not as it is discriminated by the ignorant and simple-minded. Mahāmati, it is the creation of false imagination ; nothing indicative of self-nature is to be ascertained. But, Mahāmati, there is the self-nature of things such as is ascertained by the wise, by their wise knowledge, by their wise insight,

---

[1] *L. Sūtra*, Lxxxv.

[2] *L. Sūtra*, xxxv.

[3] *L. Sūtra*, xxxi.

by their wise transcendental vision." "Mahāmati, my highest reality is the eternal-unthinkable since it conforms to the idea of a cause and is beyond existence and non-existence. Because it is the exalted state of self-realisation it has its own character; because it is the cause of (as ?) the highest reality it has its causation; because it has nothing to do with existence and non-existence it is no doer; because it is to be classed under the same head as space, Nirvāna and cessation it is eternal. The eternal-unthinkable of the Tathāgatas is thatness realised by noble wisdom within themselves".[5] "There is something in all beings which is true, real, eternal, self-governing and for ever unchanging this is called Ego, though quite different from what is known as such by the philosophers. This Ego is the Tathāgatagarbha, Buddha-nature which exists in every one of us and is characterised with such virtues as permanency, bliss, freedom and purity"—the point is thus clinchingly put in the *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra* quoted by Suzuki in the Introduction to his translation of the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra*.

Aśvaghoṣa is very clear on this point. In fact, one of the main purposes of his book is to establish it. We have here only to refer to the extract from the *Awakening of Faith* quoted in the section on the eight Vijñānas, *vide* also quotations under verses 84, 91 and 93. In the course of his summary of the contents of the *Awakening of Faith*, McGregor in his *Introduction to Mahāyāna Buddhism*[6], says: "The external world has in its essence a real existence. It is a part of the stream of life based in the essence of Mind. The world as it appears to us, however, is the result of action of the Ālaya, Klishṭa-manas and Manovijñāna (soiled mind and mind-consciousness), stimulated by contact with the

---

[4] *L. Sūtra*, Lxix.

[5] *L. Sūtra*, xvii.

[6] p. 65.

real external world, which in turn is but a phase of the universal Ālaya."

Verses 57 and 91-95 deal with Śāśvatavāda (eternalism) and Ucchēdavāda (nihilism) and the essential nature of all the Dharmas.

Anābhāsa (imageless)

Although all things are, in their fundamental nature, Tathatā or Suchness, they are not in it. In the Dharmadhātu, the particularistic ābhāsas or images composing the world of subjects and objects have no place. " The gate of highest reality has nothing to do with the two forms of thought construction (subject and object). Where the imageless stands why should we establish the three vehicles ".[7] See quotations under verses 45, 46, 47 and 48 where the imagelessness of the Ālayavijñāna is established.

" The five Dharmas, the Svabhāvas, the eight Vijñānas and the two-fold egolessness—they are all embraced in the Mahāyāna".[8] " The two-fold egolessness, the Citta, Manas and Manovijñāna, the five Dharmas, the Svabhāvas —they do not belong to my essence ".[9] Therefore, the Mahāyāna does not exist in the state of imagelesseness. " By passing on to Mind only, he passes on to the state of imagelessness ; when he establishes himself in the state of imagelessness, he sees not the Mahāyāna" .[10]

Ajāti (non-birth)

From a consideration of all that has been said so long it follows that the world of multiplicity, the dual world of subject and object, is unborn. " Thus for certain the Buddhas have brilliantly established non-birth in all respects,"

---

[7] *L. Sūtra*, xxxi.

[8] *L. Sūtra*, Lxxxiv.

[9] *Sagathakam*, 417.

[10] *Sagathakam*, 257.

says Gauḍapāda in the second line of verse 19. The Buddha says, "Mahāmati, according to the teaching of the Tathāgatas of the past, present and future all things are unborn. Why? Because they have no reality, being manifestations of Mind itself, and Mahāmati, as they are not born of being and non-being they are unborn. Mahāmati, all things are like the horns of the hare, horse, donkey or camel, but the ignorant and simple-minded who are given up to their false and erroneous imaginations, discriminate things where they are not; therefore all things are unborn. The self-nature and characteristic marks of body, property and abode are evolved when the Ālayavijñāna is conceived by the ignorant as grasping and grasped; and then they fall into a dualistic view of existence where they recognise its rise, abiding and disappearance, cherishing the idea that all things are born and subject to discrimination as to being and non-being".[11] What is meant by "all things are unborn"? The Buddha answers, "Mahāmati, not that all things are unborn, but that they are not born of themselves, except when seen in the state of Samādhi—this is what is meant by 'all things are unborn'. To have no self-nature is, according to the deeper sense, to be unborn, Mahāmati. That all things are devoid of self-nature means that there is a constant and uninterrupted becoming, a momentary change from one state of existence to another; seeing this, Mahāmati, all things are destitute of self-nature".[12] Again, "Mahāmati, the philosophers who are the gathering of the deluded, foster the notion of deriving the birth of all things from that of being and non-being, and fail to regard it as caused by the attachment to the multitudinousness which rises from the discrimination (of the Mind) itself. . . . . . .In this light the term 'unborn' is to be understood".[13]

---

[11] L. *Sūtra*, xix.

[12] L. *Sūtra*, xxvii.

[15] L. *Sūtra*, xlv.

As we have said at the beginning of this Introduction non-birth is the proposition which Gauḍapāda seeks to establish in every one of the Prakaraṇas or chapters of his book, and the Śruti not being clear on this point because it "speaks of creation equally from the born and from the unborn", he depends on reasoning for the purpose, the reasoning of the Buddha which he sets forth in the 4th Prakaraṇa. Non-birth being his theme in the whole of this Prakaraṇa, he states it at its commencement (verses 3 and 4) and goes on proving it by the establishment of emptiness in all its aspects. The passages quoted above from the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* may be considered as the text systematically followed by him. That all things are unborn "like the horns of the hare, horse, donkey or camel," he establishes by examining all ideas about causation up to verse 22 and proving their fallaciousness. Then he goes on examining "the self-nature and characteristic marks of body property and abode" up to verse 54 and proving that they are empty and that, consequently, all things are unborn. Next, he goes on showing, up to verse 80, that "the attachment to the multitudinousness which rises from the discrimination (of the Mind) itself" is the cause of the birth of the world of multiplicity and that, therefore, non-birth is the truth. In the last verses he shows that the Ālayavijñāna or Dharmadhātu is itself eternally pure, never really evolving as the world of particulars, and that they are evolved only "when the Ālayavijñāna is conceived by the ignorant as grasping and grasped", and by "their false and erroneous imaginations (they) discriminate things where they are not, and that this false evolution ceases and multiplicity disappears when transcendental knowledge is revealed and unborn infinite sameness is established within oneself (verse 100), when one knows "that the primary elements have never come into existence and that thse elements are unborn".[14]

[14] *L. Sūtra*, LI; verse 22.

Creation and Creator

From the Paramārtha or transcendental standpoint there is no causation, no birth, no creation,. no creator. "The highest reality is no doer," says the Buddha.[15] But from the Samvrti standpoint things are born,[16] they have a causation which is Paratantra.[17] "It is because of worldly usage that things are talked of as existing."[18] Who creates the world of things of wordly usage? Let the Buddha answer: "There are three attachments deep-seated in the minds of the ignorant and simple-minded. They are greed, anger and folly; and thus there is desire which is procreative and is accompanied by joy and greed; closely attached to this there takes place a succession of births in the paths. . . . . . .When one is cut off from this attachement, no signs will be seen indicative of attachment or of non-attachment";[19] and again, "owing to the procreative force of desire, there arise all kinds of disaster such as birth, age, disease, death sorrow, lamentation, pain, despair, etc".[20] The mind is the cause,[21] but not the agent of creation. It is desire or attachment which is the agent of creation, it alone possesses the procreative force. Destroy it and there is no creation. The same thing is said in verses 55, 56 and 76. Thus a person's own defiled mind is responsible for the actual creation of the world in which he moves.[22] Purify the mind and the world will disappear. "Depending upon and attaching to the triple combination (of greed, anger and folly) which works in unison, there is the continuation

---

15 *L. Sūtra*, xvii quoted on p. 33.

16 Verse 57.

17 Verse 24.

18 *L. Sūtra*, xxxi.

19 *L. Sūtra*, Lxviii.

20 *L. Sūtra*, Lxxiii.

21 *L. Sūtra*, xvii quoted on p. 33.

29 Verses 61—62.

of the vijñānas incessantly functioning and because of the attachment there is a continued and deep-felt assertion of existence. When the triple combination which causes the functioning of the vijñānas no more takes place, there is the triple emancipation, and when this is kept in view, there is no rising of any combination ", that is, the world for ever disappears.[23] This is tersely put in verse 75.

Saṁsāra and Nirvāṇa

From the Paramārtha standpoint there being no creation and therefore no bondage of birth and death, there is not also any such thing as emancipation. But from the Samvṛti standpoint there is the bondage of brith and death and hence there is also emancipation, or, Nirvāṇa, from it. The Paramārtha standpoint is expressed by the Buddha when he says, "Nirvāṇa is like a dream; nothing is seen to be in transmigration, nor does anything enter into Nirvāṇa".[24] See also quotation under verse 30 in which the same idea is expressed. From the Samvṛti standpoint the Buddha defines Nirvāna as : " Nirvāṇa is (1) where it is recognised that there is nothing but what is seen of Mind itself ; (2) where there is no attachment to external objects, existent or non-existent ; (3) where getting rid of the four propositions, there is an insight into the abode of reality as it is ; (4) where, recognising the nature of the Self-mind, one does not cherish the dualism of discrimination; (5) where grasped and grasping are no more obtainable; (6) where all logical measures are not seized upon as it is realised that they never assert themselves; (7) where the idea of truth is not adhered to but treated with indifference because of its causing a bewilderment; (8) where by the attainment of the exalted Dharma which lies within the inmost recess of one's being, the two forms of egolessness are recognised, the

---

[23] *L. Sūtra*, Lxviii.

[24] *L. Sutra*, xxxiv.

two forms of passions are subsided and the two kinds of hindrance cleared away".[25] (The numbering is mine). These characters of Nirvāṇa are shown throughout the Prakaraṇa in their respective places of treatment namely, (1) in verses 47 and 72, (2) in verse 79, (3) in verse 84, (4) in verses 27-28, 46 and 54, (5) in verses 91-92, (6) in verse 25, (7) in verses 37-41, and (8) in verses 91, 93 and 97.

Although Nirvāṇa and samsāra are relative, Nirvāṇa, which signifies extinction of desire and, consequently, of the perception of duality, is identified with Tathatā, the highest emptiness and reality, and transcendental knowledge which is one with it. Therefore, the Buddha says, "When the self-nature and the habit-energy of all the vijñānas, including the Ālaya, Manas and Manovijñāna, from which issues the habit-energy of wrong speculations. . . when all these go through a revulsion, I and all the Buddhas declare that there is Nirvāṇa, and the way and the self-nature of this Nirvāṇa is emptiness, which is a state of reality.

"Further, Mahāmati, Nirvāṇa is the realm of self-realisation attained by noble wisdom, which is free from the discrimination of eternality and annihilation, existence and non-existence. How is it not eternality? Because it has cast off the discrimination of individuality and generality, it is not eternality. How about its not being annihilation? It is because all the wise men of the past, persent and future have attained realisation. Therefore it is not annihilation. ...... Again, Mahāmati, the great Parinirvāṇa is neither destruction nor death......... Again, Mahāmati, the great Parinirvāṇa is neither abandonment nor attainment, neither is it of one meaning, nor of no-meaning; this is said to be Nirvāṇa.[26] Aśvaghosha says, "Buddha teaches that all beings are from all eternity ever abiding

[25] *L. Sūtra*, Lxxiv.

[26] *L. Sūtra*, xxxviii.

in Nirvāṇa," and explains, "In truth enlightenment cannot be manufactured, nor can it be created; it is absolutely intangible; it is no material existence that is an object of sensation....... Wisdom itself has nothing to do with material phenomena whose characteristic feature is extension in space, and there are no attributes there by which wisdom can become tangible. This is the meaning of Buddha's brief statement just referred to".[27]

This aspect of Nirvāṇa is dealt with by Gauḍapāda in verses 30 and 93 to 99.[28]

Advaya (the non-dual)

The Mind itself or the Dharmadhātu is the eternal, infinite and perfectly homogeneous principle which alone exists and nothing else. Where there are no numbers there can be no numbering. Hence, it is not strictly logical to say that the Mind or Dharmadhātu is monistic, non-dual or non-multiple. Similarly, in the realm where there is no conception of non-existence or non-eternity, we cannot rightly say that it is existence or eternity. Hence, the Mahayana formulates the dictum that the ultimate reality does not come within the purview of the four propositions namely, existence, non-existence, both existence and non-existence and not both existence and non-existence, or, oneness and otherness, bothness and not-bothness, being and not-being and eternity and non-eternity. The four propositions have been stated in these two ways in the *Awakening of Faith* and the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* respectively. Gauḍapāda has literally copied the statement of the *Awakening of Faith* in verses 83 and 84.[29]

---

27 *Awakening of Faith*, pp. 74-75.

28 For a fuller treatment of the idea of Nirvaṇa in Buddhism and its development, the reader may refer to "*The Conception of Buddhist Nirvana*" by Th. Stcherbatsky, published by the Publishing Office of the Academy of Sciences of U. S. S. R.

29 See quotation under these verses.

But still we have to express the unity of the ultimate reality in contradistinction to the apparent duality or plurality inherent in our perception of the world, and this is done in the Mahāyāna in the negative way by calling it non-dual. The same principle is followed by Gauḍapāda.[30]

But is the world, even as we perceive it, dual? If it is dual, its essence, the Tathatā or Ālayavijñāna or the mind itself, cannot be non-dual. The Buddha, therefore, says that if we intelligently examine our perception we shall see that the world also is non-dual. For, all our perceptions are dichotomous where the opposites are mutually dependent and mutual dependence disproves such independent individual existence as can alone justify two things being considered really two. We shall quote the Buddha's words: "Mahāmati, what is meant by non-duality? It means that light and shade, long and short, black and white are relative terms, Mahāmati, and not independent of each other; as Nirvāṇa and samsāra are, all things are not two. There is no Nirvāṇa except where is samsāra; there is no samsāra except where is Nirvāṇa; for, the condition of existence is not of mutually exclusive character. Therefore, it is said that all things are non-dual as are Nirvāṇa and samsāra. For this reason, Mahāmati, you should discipline yourself in (the realisation of) emptiness, no-birth, non-duality and no-self-nature".[31] Gauḍapāda follows this idea and calls the world Dvayābhāsa, a two-fold image, that is, a false presentation of duality.[32]

Āvaraṇa (veil, hindrance)

Erroneous speculations about the four propositions referred to above cover the face of the ultimate realty and present it as the world of multiplicity. "Clinging to

---

[30] Vide verses 45, 62.

[31] *L. Sūtra*, xxvii.

[32] Verses 61-62.

the memory (Vāsanā) of erroneous speculations and doctrines since beginningless time, they hold fast to ideas such as oneness and bothness, being and non-being, and their thoughts are not at all clear about what is seen of mind only".[33] "The signs of existence and non-existence are falsely imagined and go on so imagined".[34] Following this Mahāyāna idea, Gauḍapāda says that attachment to the four propositions obscures the ultimate reality to the vision of the ignorant.[35] The ultimate reality is the Jñeya or Jñāna, which are identical, hence this attachment is called Jñeyāvaraṇa or knowledge-hindrance.[36] The *Awakening of Faith* says, "Avidyā (ignorance) is called Jñeyāvaraṇa because it obscures the spontaneous exercise of wisdom from which evolve all modes of activity in the world" and the *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* says that it "is purified when the egolessness of things is distinctly perceived".[37] Another form of Āvaraṇa is spoken of. It is Kleśāvaraṇa or passion-hindrance, constituted by the defiled Vijñāna or Manovijñāna which is the vijñāna-skandha of a person. "It obscures the fundamental wisdom of Bhūtatathatā" and "is destroyed when first the egolessness of persons is perceived and acted upon, for (then) the Manovijñāna ceases to function. "The *Lankāvatāra Sūtra* further speaks of Dharma-hindrance which "is given up because of the disappearance of the habit-energy (accumulated) in the Ālayavijñāna, which is now thoroughly purified".[38] Gauḍapāda does not enter into these distinctions of Āvaraṇa based on distinctions of thing, person and habit-energy or vāsanā. He says that "attachment to any and every Dharma" is the

[33] *L. Sūtra*, xxxv.
[34] *L. Sūtra*, Lxiv.
[35] Verses 82—84.
[36] Verses 82 and 97.
[37] Vide quotations under verses 82 and 97.
[38] Vide quotations under verses 82 and 97.

āvarana of Dharmadhātu[39] that this attachment is manifested in the four ideas of existence, non-existence and so forth from which Dharmadhātu is really free,[40] and that unless touchless (intangible) transcendental knowledge (Jñāna) is fully realised the Avarana is not destroyed.[41] and this practically contains the whole idea of the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra*.

Habit-energy or attachment to name and form is the same thing as Avidyā. Its Ālaya or home is the pure Vijñāna itself, which is hence called Ālayavijñāna. The Mind (citta) is not separate from habit-energy, nor is it together with it; though enveloped with habit-energy, the Mind itself remains undifferentiated".[42] Avidyā or ignorance, which means non-recognition of the truth that the world is the Mind-manifested, is the negative aspect and habit-energy or attachment to name and form the positive aspect of false discrimination or Vikalpa. Gauḍapāda has dealt with the positive aspect.[43] "The ignorant owing to their erroneous discrimination imagine here the multiplicity of phenomena; the wise however, do not."[44]

Viparyaya (*error*) *and Māyā*

From the attachment to name and form arises the seeing of name and form. This seeing of name and form where there is the pure Mind or Vijñāna only is the Viparyaya (also called Viparyāsa) or error which constitutes the world. The Mind itself has no cognisance of name and form and hence it is free from error; in fact, there can be no darkness in light itself. This teaching of the Buddha is contained in verses 27, 31 and 41. But do not the wise also see name

---

[39] Verse 82.

[40] Verses 83-84.

[41] Verse 97.

[42] Sagathakam, 236. See verse 75 and quotations under it.

[43] Ir. verses 55-56, 75, 82, 84.

[44] *L. Sūtra*, xxiv.

and form? They do, but not with the perverted idea that they have a self-nature apart from the Mind itself. Hence the Buddha says, "Even to the wise there is this error, only that they are free from perversion. Mahāmati, it is like (that is, seen by the wise as well as by) the unwitted in the world who conceive a perverted idea regarding a mirage, a fire-brand wheel, a hair-net, the city of the Gandharvas, a dream, a reflected image and an Ākāśa-puruṣa, but with the knowing that it is not so, though it does not mean that those illusions do not appear to them".[45] The same thing is said by Gauḍapāda in verse 46.

The error, as it is, is devoid of any self-substance. It is also causeless, because the pure Mind itself cannot be its cause and objects and things are included in it. It must, therefore, be considered beginningless. The person, who is a part of the beginningless error caused under the influence of his b ginningless attachment to it, continues to be attached to it and so the error also continues birth after birth. If he can ever throw off this attachment, he will be no more born and the error will cease. The error itself is not a reality and so has nothing in it which can make a person get attached to it anew. Hence the person who has become free from the beginningless attachment no more gets attached to it and attains Nirvāṇa. The error can be compared with Māyā, or, illusion, in which things, which do not really exist, appear to all people, ignorant or wise, although the ignorant are influenced by them, while the wise are not. Hence, when the Buddha was asked "Is the error an entity or not?", he replied, "It is like Māyā, Mahāmati, the error has no character in it making for attachment. If, Mahāmati the error had any character in it making for attachment, no liberation would be possible from the attachment to existence, the chain of origi-

[45] *L. Sūtra* xliii.

nation would be understood in the sense of creation as held by the philosophers".[46] The same thing has been said by Gauḍapāda in verse 75.

It must not be supposed that the error is an effect of Māyā. Māyā is merely a magical presentation of appearances, absolutely characterless. Hence the Buddha said, "Māyā cannot be the cause of the error, because of its incapability of producing evils and faults; and thus, Mahāmati, Māyā has no discrimination of itself; it rises when invoked by the magical charm of a certain person. It has in itself no habit-energy of evil thoughts and faults that, issuing from self-discrimination, affect it. (Therefore), there are no faults in it. This is only due to the confused view fondly cherished by the ignorant regarding Mind, and the wise have nothing to do with it".[47]

In short, the world-error is world-māyā, a cosmic illusion. This world-māyā is not unreal in the sense in which an ordinary illusion is unreal. It has a persistent reality till Nirvāṇa is attained. But the things which are presented in it are momentary and so unreal like an ordinary Māyā. They are not identical with it but in it. In fact, it is the continuous, unbroken flux of momentary phenomena which is the world-error or the world-māyā. Hence the Buddha taught, "Mahāmati, Māyā is not an unreality, because, it has the appearance of reality, and all things have the nature of Māyā. It is not, Mahāmati, that all things are Māyā because they are both alike in being imagined and clung to as having multitudinousness of individual signs, but that all things are like Māyā because they are unreal and like a lightning flash which is seen as quickly disappearing."[48]

---

[46] *L. Sūtra*, xliii.
[47] *L. Sūtra*, xliv.
[48] *L. Sūtra*. xlix.

Again, as Māyā is not the cause of error, so it is not also the cause of ignorance or perverse attachment to non-existents. It is the presentation of unrealities as realities consequent on the attachment to unrealities. It is the projection of the self of perversion which hides the reality. "There is an essence entirely covered by thought-constructions and hidden inside all that has body. Because of perversion there is Māyā; Māyā, however, is not the cause of perversion."[49]

From the Paramārtha standpoint Māyā is non-existent. But in Samvṛti it is manifested through the potency of ignorance or the perverse attachment to non-existents. "As Māyā is manifested depending on grass, wood and brick, though Māyā itself is non-existent, so are all things essentially".[50] Verses 44, 58 and 69 echo these ideas, verse 58 being almost a copy of portions of the passages quoted above.

Gauḍapāda's speciality

Gauḍapāda carried the idea of Māyā further. In the *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* the appearance of the phenomenal world is Māyā, but it is not said that ignorance, owing to which the world-māyā spreads, is also Māyā. In the illustration quoted above, the world-māyā is compared with an ordinary Māyā or illusion in which illusory objects are said to spring from worldly realities like grass, wood and brick. But the world-māyā does not spring from anything which can be called a reality in comparison with the ignorance from which it springs and is equally an unreality with it. Hence Gauḍapāda gives the illustration of a Māyik seedling springing from a Māyik seed[51]. Consequently, according to him ignorance also is Māyā as its effect, the world, is Māyā.

[49] *Sagathakam*, 42.
[50] *Sagathakam*, 30.
[51] Verse 59,

Again, having conceived both the effect and the cause as Māyā, he naturally conceived the cause as possessing the power or potency (Śakti, I should say) of producing the world-māyā. This he does in verse 61 [52] where he uses the term *Māyā* in the instrumental case. Thus, according to him, the appearance of the world is Māyā, ignorance is Māyā, and its potency to produce the world is Māyā. He, therefore, uses the term *Māyā* instead of *Avidyā* (ignorance) throughout the four chapters of his treatise to mean the same thing.

Next comes the question of the seat of Maya. Maya is not an independent principle such as may not require a seat. Considered whether as the world-appearance, or as its cause ignorance or as the potency of ignorance, it must have a seat to support it, to rest on. Speaking in terms of the case of an ordinary illusion, there must be an entity in whom there is the capacity to produce the world-māyā. The *Laṅkāvatāra Sūtra* xliii, quoted above, suggests the same thing when it says : "It (Māyā) rises when invoked by the magical charm of a certain person"; but does not push the point further—perhaps it could not because it had not identified ignorance with Māyā. But Gauḍapāda having done so, had no hesitation in seating it in the Ultimate Reality. Hence, in verse 12 of the 2nd chapter and verse 10 of the 3rd chapter of his book, he calls it Ātma-māyā which, rendered in Mahāyāna terminology, may be called (Ālaya) Vijñāna-Māyā or Citta-Maya.

This identification of Māyā with Avidyā (ignorance), making the ultimate reality its support, is the foundation of the Māyāvāda of Śaṅkara. Another great speciality of Gauḍapāda's exposition which helped Śaṅkara was his masterly analysis of the lesson of a dream and of a fire-brand.

(To be continued)

---

[52] As also in verses 27-29 of the *Advaita Prakaraṇa* the 3rd Chapter of his treatise.

THE TRIPURA EPISODE IN SANSKRIT LITERATURE

By KUMARI BHAKTI SUDHA MUKHOPADHYAYA

WHILE perusing the Purānic Literature we come across an overwhelming mass of myths and legends, the one and same story recurring in a number of places. They are not simply the creations of the imagination of individual poets, and if we can catch the spirit of them, we find that they give expression to some scientific or philosophical truth under the garb of a legend.

The story of Tripura[1] or Three Cities made of three metals is found in our most ancient literature and from that onwards, the mind of people has been so impressed by this popular legend that it is represented from time to time in Sanskrit Literature, either in a well-knit story or drama or an exquisite poem, composed even in very

---

Abbreviations used:

1. Ait.=Aitareya Brāhmaṇa.
2. Bhāg.=Bhāgavata Purāṇa.
3. Ch.=Chapter.
4. D.P.=Droṇa Parvan of Mbh
5. Hv.=Harivaṁśa.
6. Jn.=Sam.=Jñāna Saṁhitā.
7. K.P.=Karṇa Parvan of Mbh.
8. Lg.=Linga Purāṇa.
9. Mat.=Matsya Purāṇa.
10. Mbh.=Mahābhārata.
11. Pd.=Padma Purāṇa.
12. Rud. Sam.=Rudra Saṁhitā.
13. Śat.=Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa.
14. Sk.=Skanda Purāṇa.
15. Svar. Kh.=Svarga Khaṇḍa.
16. Tai.=Taittirīya Saṁhitā.
17. Vai. Kh.=Vaiṣṇava Khaṇḍa.

[1] (*a*) *Tripuradāha*, Ḍima mentioned by Bharata as enacted before Parameśvara.

(*b*) *Tripuravijaya* by Bhoganātha, a companion of King Sangama II, *I.A.* XIV, 24.

(c) *Tripuravijaya Campū* by Atirātrayajvan, *Tanj.*, VIII. 3378.

(d) *Tripuradahana*, *TC.*, II. 2589.

(e) *Tripuradahana Campū*, *Tanj.* VIII. 3048.

recent times, the end of the last century[2]. Besides, there are innumerable allusions[3] to the great conflagration of Tripura in Sanskrit Literature.

In this article we propose to deal with the Tripura legend as far as the *Mahābhārata* and Purāṇas are concerned. The story occurs, twice in the *Mahābhārata*, twice in the *Skanda-Purāṇa*, as many times in the *Matsya-Purāṇa* and the *Siva-Purāṇa* and it is found only once in the *Harivaṁśa*, *Padma-Purāṇa*[4], *Saura-Purāṇa*[5], *Brahma-Vaivarta-Purāṇa*, *Bhāgavata* and *Liṅga-Purāṇa*.

The Karṇaparvan of the *Mbh.* has a very plain and simple Tripura episode which owed its origin to the old texts of the Vedic Saṁhitās[6] and Brāhmaṇas. It seems that this story and its kind had a spontaneous origin and was composed without any specific purpose in view.

The Tripura story of the Karṇa Parvan[7] of the *Mbh.*[8] is in brief as follows :

Once upon a time a great fight took place between demons and gods which resulted in the defeat of the former. The demons felt much humiliated at this and practised very

---

[2] (a) *Tripuravijaya Vyāyoga* by Padmanābha, *TC.*, III. 3370.

(b) *Tripuradahana* by Vāsudeva, *Jmy.*, XIV. 302.

(c) *Tripuravijayam* by Narāyaṇa Śāstrin of Nodukaveri of Tanj. Dist. He wrote 92 dramas including Tripuravijayam which is found in his manuscripts which are said to be with his son at Allapalam.

(d) *Tripuravijaya Campu*, by Nṛsimha, *Tanj.*, VII 3044; R. R. III. 1605.

[3] *Śivamahimnaḥstotra* by Puṣpadanta, 18.

[4] Svar. Kh. VII.

[5] XXXIV.

[6] (a) *Kāṭhaka*, XXIV, 10.

(b) *Ait.*, III. iii. Ch., 13.

(c) *Tai.*, VI. ii, 3.

(d) *Śat.*, VI. iii. 3, 25.

[7] Published by Bhandarkar Research Institute and edited by Dr. P. L. Vaidya.

[8] Ch. XXXIII.

austere penances not only to regain their lost position and prestige but to attain a very high and exalted position in the world. They were reduced to skeletons by their rigorous self-immolation and Brahmā, the Creator getting pleased at this, offered them boons. They, in a body, asked from him, immortality to which he replied that they did not deserve absolute immortality, they should rather ask for something else. The demons then asked for the ownership of three impregnable and invincible cities which could be destroyed by nobody. They further said that their moving cities would be put together after a thousand years and if then, and then only, somebody would hit all the cities together with a single arrow—the most daring undertaking for any being—they should encounter death. This request also was granted and practically they became immortal.

Then their three cities were constructed by the divine architect, Maya; one was made of gold, the other was of silver and the third one was of iron. The gold one was constructed in the heaven, the silver one was in the intermediate region and the iron city was built upon the earth.

The three cities had many palatial buildings, beautiful gates and doors and many other things. Of the demons, Tārakākṣa had the gold city, Kamalākṣa owned the silver one, and the iron one belonged to Vidyunmālin. In addition to many wonderful things, there was a miraculous well, created by Hari (a demon), the son of Tārakākṣa, which restored the dead to life. Thus, the demons became all powerful and also immortal in practice. They destroyed holy places, defiled hermitages and by all these atrocious activities proved to be a source of nuisance to the whole world. Thus troubled, all gods went to Brahmā and asked for the redress of their grievances. Brahmā, on hearing the calamity of the three worlds, suggested that they should

approach Śiva and ask help from him. The gods did so and eulogised Śiva with lengthy hymns. Śiva received them with due cordiality and asked the purpose of their arrival. Brahmā narrated the whole history and entreated Śiva kindly to deliver them from that predicament by destroying the three demons and their cities and thus put them for ever under obligation. Upon this Lord Siva said that they should rather themselves attack and defeat their enemies, in a body, with the help of his (Śiva's) weapons.

On this, the gods confessed their incompetence to do it. Then Śiva asked them to take half of his strength and then attack the demons with all their might. The gods, again, replied that they were not capable of such a great undertaking and asked Śiva himself to plunge in the war with the demons using half of the prowess of all the gods combined. All the divine forces helped in this great cause in different forms of the equipment of the battle. In this undertaking Viśvakarman started constructing the chariot for Śiva. The body of the chariot was the Earth herself, its wheels the Sun and the Moon, the Year (संवत्सर) with its six seasons turned into the bow, Kālarātrī served as the bow-string, and the arrow was the combination of Viṣṇu, Soma and Agni. Then Śaṅkara said that his charioteer must be one who was greater than he, on which gods approached Lord Brahmā and asked him to accept the office of Śiva's charioteer. Brahmā at once did as he was asked to do and Śiva mounted the chariot. As soon as Śiva boarded it, the heads of the horses—which were the four Vedas themselves—sank in the ground. However, Brahmā set everything right and made the horses run. As soon as Śiva stood stretching the string of the bow to shoot the arrow the three strongholds of the demons merged into one. The single arrow shot by Lord Śiva set the three citadels ablaze, and having destroyed the demons threw

the fortresses into the Western Sea. This is the long and short of the Tripura episode found in Karṇa-Parvan and this in some form or another can be found in other different texts.

The glorification of natural phenomena is a practice of long standing in our country. In the Vedic age poets were stirred with intuition and were provided with rich imagination when they happened to see the marvels of nature. They glorified different natural phenomena by personifying them, and composed some appropriate and beautiful narratives centring round them. Thus, when ethereal bodies, such as stars and planets, cast their spell on the soul of the poet and provided him with beautiful ideas and imageries, our literature had legends like the story under discussion.

In the Tripura legend, we find the beautiful representation of a certain astral position—the appearance and disappearance of a certain group of stars—in a well designed story. It represents the account of three stars, an astrological phenomenon. The esoteric position of the three castles in heaven, ether and earth is that they were three stars, which came into view in the sky at a certain time. Gold, silver and iron represent the reddish, bright white and bluish colour of those particular stars. That stars do have different tinges of colour is a thing of common experience, e.g. the planet Mars has a reddish tinge and the morning star has a bright silvery colour. This group of stars led the poet of fertile imagination to conceive them as castles made of three metals.

In astrology, stars count very much for the good and evil of the world. The rise of some stars is favourable for the world and that of others exercises evil influence over it. The story tells us that the whole world was troubled and upset by the attrocities of the three demons

committed with the help of their three strongholds. This calamity of the world represents the malignant force that was the outcome of a certain astral position. The comet is regarded ominous according to the science of Hindu omens. In like manner, these particular stars also shared the same fate. As the rise of these stars brought about chaos and commotion over the world, it is very likely that Brāhmaṇas, gods and sages who were entrusted with the task of bringing in and maintaining peace and order in the world, approached Śiva, the source of welfare and goodness and asked him to deliver them from the calamity which had befallen them. Then Śiva, the merciful god, was out for destroying the foul influence of the triad of the planets. But planets or stars, however small and insignificant they might appear from the earth, are too potent and powerful to be easily propitiated or destroyed. Even Śiva, the all-powerful, is not capable, by himself alone, to face the evil force of these stars. So he was in need of additional hands such as Viṣṇu and Brahmā, and the Triad, with combined force, was fit for the task. Not only this but all the powerful and benign things of heaven and earth contributed to this great cause.

The Tripura story, found in some Purāṇas, e.g., in the *Matsya Purāṇa*,[9] in the *Liṅga Purāṇa*[10], in the *Śiva Purāṇa*[11] (Jñāna Saṁ.) and in the *Saura Purāṇa*[12] agrees completely with *Karṇa Parvas*, in that that Śiva hit the three cities simultaneously at a certain astrological moment and almost all the texts say that it was done with a single arrow. This signifies that the devilish force of those sinister planets was so strong, so insurmountable that even the strength of the Triad (Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva) could not be equal

---

[9] *Mat*, CXXIX., 24.

[10] *Lg.* LXXI., 17.

[11] *Śiva P.*, (Jn. Sṃ) XIX., 57.

[12] *Saura P.*, XXXIV., 13.

to that so they waited for a suitable occasion i.e., the help of the favourable position of another particular planet. The star Puṣya stood in the same line with the above group and then their devilish force got exhausted. Then the three stars combined and gradually disappeared from the sky and the world was restored to its normal peaceful condition.

The leading idea of the story is that the devillish force, however strong it may be, has got to stoop at last, to the Benign One, शिव. Most humbly it can be presumed that such an interpretation will clarify the mystic and legendary character of the story.

We will not be wrong if we take the story as the mythological representation of a spiritual phenomenon i.e. the destruction of Avidyā and its result Brahma-realisation. The three cities represent the three bodies—Sthūla, Sūkṣma and Kāraṇa Śarīras or the three stages called Jāgrat, Svapna and Suṣupti. The Pure Self is beyond these three stages and self-realisation is possible when these are transcended. Brahman is to be realised by the removal or destruction of these obstacles. To explain it more clearly, Ātman is Eternal and Pure Consciousness, but it is not seen in its true nature as it is enveloped with the screen of Avidyā as our real perspective is tampered with. The above three bodies are the resultants of Avidyā. These bodies are as foul as the three demons—three embodiments of evil. They are the barriers which hide the Ultimate Self from the vision of the Jīva. There can be no rest, no peace, as long as they continue to exist and this is represented in the story by the chaos brought about by the demons. Vyāvahārikī Sattā is too strong to be replaced by the Pāramārthikī and the latter cannot be realised unless the real nature of the former is known. Here the iron city represents the Sthūla Śarīra, which is the immediate product of matter and as it is insentient it cannot reflect the Pure Consciousness, in the

least. It is to be found in the Viśva and Vaisvānara form. The silver city signifies the Sūkṣma Śarīra which is luminous and which is Hiraṇyagarbha in its aggregate form. This being comparatively pure can have the glimpse of Consciousness but the mind and the senses still create obstacles. The gold city can be interpreted as the Kārana Sarira, which is the essence underlying the five sheaths. In this subtle stage, there is oneness with the Blissful One and there is no सम्बन्धत्रितयावगाहिज्ञान.

These are the three stages already stated. In the first (Jāgrat stage) the Atman Vaisvānara is seated in the waking consciousness, sensing external objects with all the senses. In the second stage (Svapna) it is present in the dreaming consciousness sensing internal objects and experiencing the elementary subtle world. In deep sleep (Suṣupti) the sleeper desires nothing, dreams not at all, becoming one with the state of deep sleep, is a mass of (undifferentiated) consciousness filled with bliss. As this stage is illumined with the Luminous Self (the aggregate form being Īśvara and the individual being Prājña) it is aptly likened to the gold city.

The cities are called 'Puras' and this suggests that they are different bodies. That 'Pura' was a name of the body can be explained well with reference to 'नवद्वारे पुरे देही' in the *Bhagavadgītā* and the word 'Puruṣa'.

Now, how to attain the stage when the Ātman is 'स्वस्थ' i.e. Pure Consciousness—unchangable and unchanged? It is the stage when matter or gross body is annihilated and Brahman is revealed in this true nature.

But how is that to be achieved? It is to be realized by striving hard to a great extent. The evil force of matter and its cause Avidyā are to be vanquished by dint of some stronger force, the Divine Force. This is represented in the legend by the strength and equipment supplied by all deities.

These three stages, beginning with the gross, are to be found in the Jīva, and Śiva, Pure Knowledge incarnate is to annihilate them with his single arrow, i.e. Jñāna. Once it is achieved all past Karma and its resultant name and form are consumed.

Now to come to the Purāṇas, we find that there are more than one version of the Tripura episode and different texts with the same or similar version show surprising parallelism. This suggests that different narratives of the same or similar version have been derived from a common source or each has drawn upon the other. So dividing all the Purāṇic Tripura episodes according to their contents, we find there are three recensions of the legend. They disagree with one another in character and each of them has got some particular points and readings which are exclusively its own and are not found in other recensions.

We have already dealt with the Karṇa Parvan (*Mbh.*) version of the Tripura story. Similar accounts are to be found in the *Linga-P.*, *Śiva-P.* (Jñāna Saṁ.) *Śiva-P.* (Rudra Saṁ., Yuddha Kh.), *Saura-P.*, *Bhāgavata-P.* and the first Tripura legend of the *Matsya-P.* Though the account of the Droṇa Parvan (*Mbh.*) resembles somewhat the above version, yet, at some places, it agrees with some stanzas of the second version found in the *Matsya-P.* Among the stories of these Purānic texts, though there is verbal agrement, *in toto* in some cases and in others there is difference of a word or a few words, yet the ideas and expressions are identical or quite similar. For pointing out their identical character we have arranged parallel stanzas from each text, taking Karṇa Parvan as the basis. The episode covers 110 stanzas of Ch. XXXIII[13] of the text. Stanzas, which have no counterpart in other texts have been totally left out and those common to the different texts have been

[13] *K.* P., XXXIII., 3-12.

arranged in parallel lines. The marks = have been put against cases of total verbal agreement and those of partial verbal agreement (even though there is the variance of one single word) have been marked with ±. In the table arranged we have totally left out the account found in the *Brahma-Vai-P.*, because it alludes only to Śiva's eulogy to Durgā and his subsequent activity, killing of Tripura. So the table of this version is as follows :—

K. P. XXXIII	Lg. LXXI	Śiva P. (Jn. Sam.) XIX	Śiva P. (Rud. Sam.) (Yuddha Kh.) I	Mat. CXXIX	Saura P. XXXIV	Bhāg. VII. 10	D. P. CCI	Hv. Bhaviṣya. P. CXXXIII
4^b 5^a	± 10	=45	=19	± 5, 6	± 17			
6^b 7^a	± 11	$=50^b$ 51^a	± 27–30	± 12, 19—21^a	± 18			
7^b 8^a	± 12	± 52		± 21^b22^a	± 19^a			
8	= 13	=53	± 37	± 22^b23^a	± 10			
9	± 14	± 54	± 42	± 23^b24^a	± 11 a			
10	± 15	=55	± 45		± 11			
11	± 16	± 56	± 50		± 12			
12	± 17	± 57		± 24	± 13			
12^c	$=18^a$	± 58^a	± 54^b	± 25	± 14^a			
14^a	± 18^b	± 60^a	± 57^a	± 26–28	± 14^b			
15	± 19	-60^b 61^a		± 33 34	± 15	± 53		
16	± 20^a	± 61^b		± 30^b	± 16^a	± 54^a		
18	± 20^b 21^a	± 61^c 62^a	$=57^b58^a$	CXXX ± 7, 8, 9	± 16			
24				± 11				
25				+ 16^b17^a		± 59^b 60		
27–29	± 95	XXII + 5^b 7^a	V ± 49–58	CXXXII ± 1–3	± 47 48	± 55		17–20
33	+ 68.69	XX + 5^b	II III ± 9 1		+ 37^a			
65	LXXII ± 1	XXIV =1	VII =4	CXXXIII ± 16	XXXV ± 2			
66								
67^a	± 9^b		=12	± 21^b	± 8^a		± 71^b	

K. P. XXXIII	Lg. LXXII	Śiva P. (Jn. Sam.) XXIV	Siva P. (Rud. Sam.) (Yuddha Kh.) VII	Mat. CXXXIII	Saura P. XXXV	Bhāg. VII. 10	D. P. CCI	Hv. Bhaviṣya P. CXXXIII
68[a]	± 3	± 2	± 5	± 18[a]	± 3[a]		± 72	
69				± 36 37				
70[a]	± 7[a]		=9[b]	± 17[b]				
74				± 23 24				
75	± 23[a]	=10[a]	=25	± 39 40	± 15			
76	± 24 25[a]	± 11[a]	± 26[a]	± 41	± 16			
93		± 11[b]		± 31[b]	± 11[b]			
98	± 26	± 13[b]	± 24[a]	± 52				
99	± 29[b] 30[a]			± 55				
			IX					
100[a]	± 33[a]	± 16[b]	11	± 58				
			X					
104	± 101	± 37	± 20		± 33	± 57		± 38[a]
				CXL				
105	± 102	=33	± 14	± 44	± 34[a]			
106	± 103	± 34	± 15		± 34[b]	± 68[b] 69[a]		

The Tripura account of the Karṇa Parvan and other Purāṇas mentioned above falls under the first recension of this story. The second version comprises the second recension of the story of the *Matsya- P.*, that is found in the *Skanda-P.* (Āvantya Kh., Revā Kh.) and the *Padma-P.* (Svar. Kh.). To find out the identical stanzas or expressions we have to take the second story of the *Matsya-P.* as the basis. All the above three contain the same account, the same main incidents and the setting also is the same. The introductory incidents although the same in the above three texts, differ altogether from the first version. In the epics and Purāṇas different episodes are introduced in course of the narration of different activities of deities or to inculcate some moral from the life or activities of any individual or group of individuals. The first version of the story has probably come into being in this way. The account of the *Karṇa Parvan* is very simple and has, most probably, been introduced to persuade Śalya[14] to accept the office of a charioteer as Brahmā did in Tripura War. In other stories of this version, of course, a further end is to be served by means of this episode. In these developed forms of the story, is narrated how evils slip in when higher ethical principles are forsaken and when people are given to vices[15]. In the *Liṅga-P.*, in both texts of the *Śiva-P.* and in the *Saura-P.* successful attempts have been made to ridicule the heterodox religious principles and to show how these as well as want of loyalty to husbands on the part of women pave the way to ruin.[16] Thus, we find that these are more or less of the same character.

The second recension, of course, emphasises that the greatest merit of a woman consists in being loyal to her

---

14 *Ibid*, I. 114.

15 *Mat*, CXXXI, 39-45.

16 *Lg.*, LXXI, 73-82.

husband. A truly faithful, devoted wife can perform miracles by her merit and the three cities could move about at random by means of the miraculous effect of the power of women[17]. They were degraded from their position through the instrumentality of Nārada[18] who advised them to take up ostentatious vows. The moment they lost faith in the duties of wifehood and attached more importance to rituals and dogmas, they fell and this according to this recension was the greatest factor[19] in the fall of the three cities. So it can be said that though the primary object of introducing this episode was the glorification of the river Narmadā, yet the glorification of chastity or satītva of women may form its secondary aim and this point again, is emphasised in some texts of the first recension as the *Liṅga-P.*, both the texts of the *Śiva-P.* and the *Saura-Purāṇa*.

The following are the stanzas found common in the three texts of the second recension and in the Droṇa Parvan of the first :—

---

[17] *Śiva P.*, (Rud. Saṁ.), IV, I.—V, 48.

[18] (a) *Mat.*, CLXXXVII., 26-51.
(b) *Pd.*, VII., 25-37.
(c) *Sk.* (Âvantya Kh. Revā Kh.), XXVI, 90—XXVII, 11.

[19] (a) *Mat.*, CLXXXVIII., 10.[a]
(b) *Pd.*, VII., 47.
(c) *Sk.*, XXVII., 13.
(d) *Lg.*, LXXI, 83-89.
(e) *Śiva P.*, (Jn. Saṁ), XXII, 1[a].
(f) *Śiva P.*, (Rud. Saṁ), V, 55—VI, 2.
(g) *Saura P.*, XXXV., 44.

Mat. CLXXXVII	Pd. (Svar. kh.) VII	Sk. (Āvantyakh. Revā kh.) XXVI	D. P. CCI
1	± 1		
2	= 2		
3	± 3		
4	= 4		
5	± 5		
6	± 6	± 24	
7	± 7	± $25^{b}26^{a}$	
8	± 8	± 27	
9	± 9	± 31^{b}	
10	± 10	± 37	
11	± 11	± 38	
12	± 12	± 39	
13	± 13	± 40	
14	± $13^{c}14^{a}$	± 41	
14^{c}	± 14^{b}	± 42^{b}	
15	± 15	± 49	
16	± 16	± 53	
17	± 17	± 54	
18	= $18^{b}19^{a}$		
19	± $19^{b}20^{a}$		
20	± $20^{b}21^{a}$		
21	± 21		
22^{a} 23^{b}	± 22		
24	± 23		
25	± 24		
26	± 25		
27	± 26		
28	± 27		
29	± 28		
47^{a}	= 33^{a}		
		XXVII	
48	= 33^{b} 34^{a}	= 1^{b} 2^{a}	
49	± 34^{b} 34^{c}		
50	± 35	± 3^{a} 4^{b}	
51	± 36		
52	± 37		
CLXXXVIII			
1	± 38^{b} 39^{a}		
2	± 39^{b} 40^{a}		
		XXVIII	CCI
3	± 40^{b} 41^{a}	9	76^{b}
4	± 41^{b} 42^{a}	± 10^{a} 13^{a}	
6	± 43^{b} 44^{a}	± 12	

Mat. CLXXXVII	Pd. (Svar. kh.) VII	Sk. (Āvantya kh. Revā kh.) XXVI	D-P. CCI
7	$=44^{b}\ 45^{a}$		78^{b}
8^{a}	$\pm 45^{b}$		81^{a}
$8^{b}\ 9^{a}$	± 49	$\pm 23^{b}\ 24^{b}$	$\pm 81^{b}\ 82^{a}$
$9^{b}\ 10^{a}$	± 47		
$10^{b}\ 11^{a}$	± 48		
$11^{b}\ 12^{a}$	± 49	± 26	
$12^{b}\ 13^{a}$	± 50	$=27$	
$13^{b}\ 14^{a}$	± 51		
14^{b}	$\pm 52^{a}$	$\pm 29^{b}$	
15^{a}	$\pm 52^{b}$		
$15\ 16^{a}$	± 53	± 34	
$16\ 17^{a}$	± 54	± 35	
17	$\pm 55^{a}$		
18	$\pm 55^{b}\ 56^{a}$		
19^{b}	$\pm 57^{a}$	$\pm 37^{a}$	
20	$\pm 57\ 58$	$\pm 27^{b}\ 38^{a}$	
21^{a}	$=58^{b}$	$=38^{b}$	
21	$\pm 59^{b}$	$\pm 39^{a}$	
22	$\pm 59^{b}\ 60^{a}$		
23	$\pm 60^{b}\ 61^{a}$		
25	± 64		
26	± 65		
27^{a}	$=66^{b}$	$\pm 47^{b}$	
$27^{b}\ 28^{a}$	± 67	± 48	
$28^{b}\ 29^{a}$	± 68		
$29^{b}\ 30^{a}$	$=69$		
$30^{b}\ 31^{a}$	$=70$		
$31^{b}\ 32^{a}$		$=51$	
$32^{b}\ 33^{a}$		± 52	
$34^{b}\ 35^{a}$		± 53	
42^{b}	$\pm 72^{b}$	$\pm 54^{b}$	
43	$=73$	$=65^{b}\ 66^{a}$	
44	$\pm 74^{b}\ 75^{a}$		
45^{a}	$\pm 75^{b}$		
$45^{b}\ 46^{a}$	± 76	± 67	
$46^{b}\ 47^{a}$	± 77		
47^{b}	$\pm 78^{a}$	$\pm 69^{a}$	
48	$\pm 78^{b}\ 79^{a}$		
49	± 80		
50	± 81		
51	$\pm 82^{b}\ 84^{a}$		
52	± 84		
53	± 85		

Mat. CLXXXVII	Pd. (Svar. kh.) VII	Sk. (Āvantya kh. Revā kh.) XXVIII	D. P. CCI
54	± 86		
55	± 88^a		
56	± 88		
57^a	± 89^a		
58^b 59^a	± 90		
60	= 91^b 92^a	= 79	
61^a	± 92^b		
61^b	± 93^a		
63	± 95	± 84	
64	± 96		
65	± 97		
66	± 98		
67	± 99		
70	± 102	± 102	
71	= 103		
72^a	± 104^b	± 105^b	
73^b	± 105^b		
74^a	± 106^a		
74^b	± 106^b	± 106^b	
75	± 107	± 108^b 109^a	
76	± 108		

The third version of the Tripura story is to be found only in the *Skanda-P.*[20] It says that there was a demon whose name itself was Tripura. He happened to possess a palace called Tripura having performed penance at Prayāga.[21] So far we have found that there was no disagreement about the existence of three cities but their ownership is attributed neither to three demons nor to demon Bāṇa but to Tripura.[22] This version was composed to glorify the full moon day of Kārtika[23] which is generally called Kārtikī Pūrṇimā.

So long we have treated points of agreement. Now our business would be to pick out points of difference from

[20] Vai. Kh., XXXV

[21] *Sk. P. Vai. kh.* XXXV., 37.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid*, XXXV., 37.

F. 10

different texts. The Karna Parvan says that the gold city was in heaven, the silver city in Ākāśa and the iron one was on the earth. The castle of gold city belonged to Tārakākṣa, the silver castle was possessed by Kamalākṣa and Vidyunmālin occupied the iron one. These three again merged into one when Śiva shot them together with his arrow. The Droṇa Parvan of the *Mbh.* reverses the ownership of cities between Kamalākṣa and Tārakākṣa.[24] As to the names and parentage of the demons and their relationship among themselves the various Purāṇas differ. The story in the *Saura-P.* says that the demons were called Vidyunmālin, Tārakākhya[25] and Kamalākhya instead of Tārakākṣa and Kamalākṣa. The iron city on the earth belonged to Vidyunmālin, Tārakākhya had the silver one in the Ākāśa and the gold one of heaven was in the possession of Kamalākhya. So far we have seen that the iron city invariably belonged to Vidyunmālin. But the *Matsya-P.* has entirely changed the persons and has totally upset the order. According to it, Tārakākhya was the owner of the iron city, Vidyunmālin of the silver and the gold city was inhabited by Maya, the architect.[26] According to the *Bhāgavata*[27] there was only Maya in the party of demons who was the possessor of three cities. The *Harivaṁśa* does not refer to any individual demon or individuals but simply says that there were three cities, moving in the air, under the possession of demons.[28]

---

[24] *D.P.*, CCI., 65.

[25] *Saura P.* 6.

[26] *Mat.* CXXX., 7.9.

[27] *Bhāg.*, VII. X. 53.

[28] *Hv.*, CXXXIII, 1.

All the texts, containing the second version of the story say that the three cities were possessed by the same demon Bāṇa.[29]

About the genealogy of the demons the Karṇa Parvan is silent. It refers only to demons (Tārakākṣa, Kamalākṣa and Vidyunmālin) without trying to find out any relationship among them.[30] The Droṇa Parvan also agrees here. According to the *Matsya-P.*, Maya was the important personality among the demons and Vidyunmālin and Tārakākṣa were his associates.[31] It omits Kamalākṣa or Kamalākhya. In accordance with the *Liṅga-P.*, Vidyunmālin, Tārakākṣa and Kamalākṣa were three brothers,[32] who were the sons of the demon Tāraka and grandsons of Tāra. The *Jñānasaṁhitā* version of the *Śiva-P.* repeats the same genealogy.[33] The *Rudra Saṁhitā* tells the same thing without any reference to Tāra,[34] the grandfather of the demons. The *Saura P.* too is silent about their grandfather. The *Bhāgavata* says nothing about the fatherhood of Maya.

The nature of penance performed by the demons is as follows :

The story occuring in the Karṇa Parvan says that the demons, as they got vanquished, practised severe penance. Brahmā appeared before them and offered them a boon, upon which they asked for immortality. Brahmā replied that that would be anything but possible, and then the demons asked for the possession of the three moving cities

---

29 (a) *Mat.* CLXXXVII, 8.
(b) *Pd.*, VII., 8.
(c) *Sk.*, XXVI, 27.

30 *K. P* , XXXIII, 18.

31 *Mat.*, CXXIX, 5^b 6^a.

32 *Lg.* LXXI, 8-9.

33 *Śiva P.*, (Jn. Saṁ), XIX. 42-44.

34 *Śiva P.* (Rud. Saṁ), I, 7-8.

by means of which they could go wherever they liked. This having been granted, they secured absolute invincibility and thus became unconquerable. They were over-confident of their security and this made them imperious.[35] The *Linga P.*[36] the *Śiva P.*[37] and the *Saura P.*[38] are of the same view. The *Matsya P.* has got a detailed description of the penance of the demons. In winter they used to practise penance in water and in summer amidst five fires. In the rainy season they used to live in open places. They had to subsist on fruits and roots, flowers and water. Their bark garment was covered with moss. They started taking food on alternate days. By these austerities they were reduced to skeletons.[39] The *Rudra Saṁhitā* version of the *Śiva P.* too has a similar detailed description of the austere asceticism practised by the demons.[40] Other Purāṇas containing the same recension of the story simply refer to their austerities.

The rule of the three demons was not beneficial to the world. The *K. P.* says that the demons became very proud on the conferment of the boon. They destroyed and defiled holy places and hermitages and thus put mortals and immortals all to trouble.[41] The *D.P.* too says that the demons became very proud, and started troubling the world.[42] The *Linga P.* the *Śiva P.* and the *Saura P.* do not say anything about the atrocities of the demons but they say that when they (the demons) came into power, gods felt themselves

---

35 *K. P.*, XXXIII., 5-12.

36 *Lg.*, LXXI, 89-94.

37 *Śiva P.*, (Jn. Saṁ), XXII. 1^b —6 & (Rud. Saṁ.), 50^b - 54^b.

38 *Saura P.*, XXXIV., 47.

39 *Mat.* CXXIX., 3-10.

40 *Śiva P.* (Rud. Saṁ.), I. 10-23.

41 *K. P.* XXXIII., 27-29.

42 *D. P.* CCI, 67^b -68.

humiliated and could not bear with their supremacy.[43] The *Bhāgavata* says that the demons started destroying the three worlds having recollected the former enmity with them.[44] The *Matsya P.* contains a detailed account and has an elaborate description of the misconduct and atrocities of the demons. According to it the demons, though once virtuous, were addicted to vices due to the influence of Kali or Evil personified. They forsook truth and piety and turned undutiful. They started hating Brāhmanas and did not worship deities. They did not pay respect to elders. They became angry with each other and were ever ready to quarrel. They slighted their own religion, condemned each other and became very proud. They did not wash their feet after answering nature's calls. They illtreated Brāhmaṇas, destroyed hermitages, and broke the temples of gods. Thus the whole world was upset by them[45].

According to the first version of the story, gods, troubled by the tyranny of demons, approached Brahmā[46] or Viṣṇu and from there all in a body went to Siva[47] to solicit his favour. But in the second version they approached

---

43 *Lg.*, LXXI. 38.
Śiva P. (Jn. Saṁ), XIX. 81.
Śiva P. (Rud. Saṁ), II. 3.
Saura P., XXXIV., 22.

44 *Bhāg.*, VII. X, 55.

45 *Mat.* CXXXI., 39-50.

46 *K. P.*, XXXIII., 30.

47 (a) *Ibid.*, 35.
(b) *Lg.*, LXXI., 39.
(c) *Śiva* P. (Jn. Saṁ), XIX., 82.
(d) *Śiva P.* (Rud. Saṁ.), II, 3.
(e) *Saura P.*, XXXIV., 22.
(f) *Mat. P.*, CXXXII., 4.

Śiva directly[48]. In most of the texts it is said that the demons are invincible as long as they are virtuous and Śiva stands in need of help from other gods in the form of the equipments of war and the chariot which were instantly supplied, Brahmā took upon himself the great undertaking of a charioteer. The *Bhāgavata* does not say anything expressly about the external divine help as to the construction of the chariot and the supply of war missiles. The *Harivaṁśa* is quite silent about Śiva's being provided with the chariot constructed by gods or any other help in the form of war implements.

The variations, it seems, were due to ignorance or carelessness of the compilers or the desire of the poet to secure some artistic effect in his composition or to the intention to emphasise the viewpoint of the author of the particular version. The greater the difference in time and place the greater the variation. According to Dr. Hazra the present *Liṅga P.* was written later than 1000 A.D. The *K. P.* version which belongs to the later portion of the *Mbh.* might have been composed between 200-300 A. D. The *Śiva P.* is a Saivite Purāṇa in its strict sense and Śaivism

---

48 (a) *Mat.* CLXXXVII., 5.
(b) *Pd.*, VII., 5.
(c) *Sk.*, XXVI, 7.

49 (a) *K. P.*, XXXIII., 63-71.
(b) *Lg.*, LXXI., 61—LXXII., 26.
(c) *Śiva P.* (Jn. Saṁ), XXIII, 23b—XXIV., 12.
(d) *Śiva P.* (Rud. Saṁ), VI, 50-52 ; VIII., 4-28.
(e) *Saura P.*, XXXV., 1-16.
(f) *Mat.*, CXXXIII., 15-40.
(g) *Mat.*, CLXXXVIII, 3-7.
(h) *Pd.* VII, 40-45.
(i) *Sk.*, XXVIII., 9-18.
(j) *D. P.* CCI., 71-78.

came into existence before 600 A. D. It seems that both the texts of this Purāṇa were very much familiar with Materialism or the Cārvāka system of philosophy. This system prevailed in the post-*Mahābhārata* age. So the *Śiva P.* might have been composed about the fifth or sixth century A. D. The *Saura P.* is quoted by Hemādri in the thirteenth century and therefore the Purāṇa claims a considerable priority to this century. Having come into existence more or less in the same period of time, all the above texts resemble closely. The second narrative of the *Matsya P.* was composed later than 800 A. D. The combination of the *Ādi kh.* and the *Brahma kh.* of the *Padma P.* is known as the *Svar. kh.* according to the Baṅgavāsī edition. The composition of *Ādi kh.* cannot reasonably be placed before 950 A. D. and *Brahma kh.* refers to the gift of lamp to Viṣṇu shrine which became popular about the end of the ninth century. Thus we find the *Svar kh.* of the Baṅgavāsī edition and the second version of the story of the *Matsya P.* were composed about 1000 A. D. The *Skanda P.* narrative must have been composed later than these. The *Harivaṁśa* which is in reality a Purāṇa in character but forms an appendix (khila) to the *Mbh.* is a post-*Mahābhārata* work. It is not the work of one single compiler but many portions, probably, were inserted at quite different times. So we find the Tripura story of this text has few things in common with the texts discussed as both the versions seem to have been separated by a wide gulf of time, extending the date of the episode to a period before and after 1000 A.D.

The first narrative of the *Matsya P.* seems to have originated late (though the compilation of the Purāṇa took a considerable length of time and the beginning of this goes back to great antiquity). That is why this portion of the Purāṇa has attained an elaborate form. According to Dr. Hazra, the *Matsya P.* chapters containing this story, except

the interpolated portions, if any, are earlier than the beginning of the twelfth century A. D., as Ballālasena quotes a line from Ch. CXXXIV of the *Matsya P.* in connection with the burning of Tripura. As it was composed at a stage of great literary progress, it has got well-developed language in Kāvya style, elaborate figures, poetic imageries, all that approximate the artificial poetry of classical Sanskrit Literature. This version is the most lengthy one and this also corroborates the conclusion that it is of somewhat later origin. It attained a very much expanded form because it developed almost every detail of the story. It narrates the story about Maya's construction of three cities and we find a very picturesque description with reference to this, which does not fall short of any one found in classical Sanskrit Literature. It is as follows:—

In the three cities there are innumerable buildings made of gold, silver and iron. There are hundreds of lordly buildings, gardens, wells and tanks adorned with lotuses. There are Aśoka groves with cuckoos of sweet notes in them. Beautiful picture-houses are there. There are seven, eight or ten-storied buildings having banners or flags, flowers or wreaths on them. These houses are so high that they are about to touch the sky and so white that they look like a row of swans. These houses have the sweet music of jingling zones (of women) and they are always full of sweet scent and sweet-smelling flowers. Strings of flowers hang there in decorative designs. There are mountain-like huge walls surrounding the cities. The cities have pleasure gardens, tanks, rivers, heaps of flowers all that beautify the cities.[50]

Not only it has got elaborate descriptions but it betrays also the sign of an elaborate development of alaṅkāras, like *Śleṣa* in,

---

[50] *Mat.* CXXX, 13-26.

'आरोहसंक्रमवतीं चित्ररूपां कथामिव',[51]

Upamās in

'अनायतनमासाद्य सीदते गुणवानिव',[52]

or in

'शैथिल्यं याति स रथः स्नेहो विप्रकृतो यथा',[53]

or in

'प्रययुस्तत् पुरं हन्तु शरीरमिव व्याधयः',[54]

or in

'उपद्रवैः कुलमिव पीयते त्रिपुरे नमः',[55]

There is the description of tender emotions of Kāvya in

'प्रियावगूढा दयितोपगूढा
काचित् प्ररूढांगरुहापि नारी।
सुचारुवाष्पांकुरपल्लवानां
नवाम्बुसिक्ता इव भूमिरासीत् ॥[56]

Though it is very difficult to determine the specific order of chronology, it seems that the stories occurring in the *Linga P.*, the *Matsya P.* etc. are the latest phase of the Purāṇic Tripura story and therefore came to have some literary peculiarities in their compilations.

It appears that the Tripura episode was exploited by the authors of the different versions for an eulogy of their creeds in the Puranic literature, though no such purpose is to be discovered in the primary forms of the composition of this story as in the Vedic Literature and the *Mahābhārata*.

---

[51] *Mat.* CXXXVI, 12.
[52] *Ibid*, 55.
[53] *Ibid*, 56.
[54] *Mat.* CXXXVIII, 3.
[55] *Mat.* CXXXIX, 21.
[56] *Mat.* CXXXIX, 35.

TEACHINGS OF THE DHAMMAPADA

By B. Karunes

Dhammapada does not appear in the *Sutta-Piṭaka* merely as a part of the Piṭaka, but it claims to represent the whole of the Piṭaka in one volume. It is considered by the Buddhists as the only fully representative and reliable book on *Sutta-Piṭaka*. It is claimed that all the verses in it were originally composed by the Buddha himself for the purpose of compiling the extracts of the *Sutta-Piṭaka*. It is generally believed, however, that the first publication of these compiled extracts was the work of Buddhaghoṣa shortly after the Buddha's death. *Sutta-Piṭaka*, and consequently the *Dhammapada*, is the message of the Buddha and contains ethical points derived from the philosophical concepts of the Abhidhamma.

The first verse of the book is, to my mind, the most important statement of the whole work. It says: "Of all the dhammas (implies any real and/or imaginary object) Mind is in the forefront, Mind is the greatest; Dhammas are made of Mind. It is only with the inspirations of the Mind that beings talk or act. Dukkham (result of actions) follows the Mind as the wheels of a cart follow the tracks after the horses."[1] I call this the most important verse in the Dhammapada for this conception is generally accepted, though in varying forms, by most of the existing philosophies as well as Buddhism. I shall try to discover the significance of the words 'Mind' and 'Dhamma' and 'Dukkha' in Buddhist philosophy. In *Sutta-Piṭaka* there are mentioned four Skandhas or Stages of being. They are (I) Suffering, (II) Experience and Sense, (III) Belief, Faith, or Religion and (IV) Mind or Psy-

---

[1] *Jamakabaggo*-1.

chology. The general name for the first three is Dhamma-skandha. The fourth one is called the scientific stage, i.e. the stage for analytical knowledge. This stage, being the guiding factor of the other stages, is said to be the foremost of all the stages of Being of Dhamma. We find Dukkha to be a stage of being which is the result of actions in general. We should also note here that we get the word 'Sukham', that is, happiness, which is also said to follow action only after going through the stage of analytical knowledge, and never before, whereas Dukkham is always of the first stage, and in some cases, is also the result of action after the last stage. We must keep these definitions and the statement of the first verse in mind as we study the *Dhammapada*.

Dhammapada declares that "Fools do not know that we shall not live in this world for ever, but those who know this, find that their troubles are at an end."[2] I should like to know to which place we do go then. What is to be understood by 'this world'? We shall find an explanation in the *Dhammapada* itself, only to see that the above statement is without analytical comprehension. "Some come back to the womb, sinners go to hell, virtuous men go to heaven and those without desire attain Nibbāna."[3] "Not in the sky nor in the sea nor in the mountains nor anywhere else in the world does there exist a place where death cannot touch the creatures there".[4] Thus, we know the extent of 'this world' (Ettha) and the alternative places to which we may go—as imagined by the Buddha. If we ask where heaven or hell is, there is no reply. From the above list, however, we know that they are not in the sky or below the sea or at any other place connected with our 'ettha'. "He whose movements have come to an end, whose sorrows have end-

[2] *Jamakabaggo*-6.
[3] *Pāpabaggo*-11.
[4] *Pāpabaggo*-13.

ed, who is free from all sides and who is free from all ties, has no suffering."[5] The Buddhist may quote the above verse to make me understand that we do not have to go anywhere in particular to go to heaven or hell, or to attain Nibbāna—the mere cessation of movement, that is the attainment of them. I ask, then, why the Buddha tries to rouse our fear by saying, "Now you have come to old age—now you are approaching death—you have no shelter on your way—you have nothing to spend on the journey."[6] What are these ways and these journeys? Does the Buddhist metaphysic not lose its coherence in this?

Of the body it says, "Very soon will this body lie on the earth as insignificant and lifeless as a worthless piece of wood."[7] It tells us, "This body is the source of all diseases and is fragile—this unclean body is broken, this life ends with death."[8] There are many other verses of this nature which prove our body to be quite insignificant so far as "self" is concerned, but "self" is not anywhere clearly defined. We find, "Attā is the lord of Attā, Attā is the shelter of Attā. Control your Attā as the merchant controls his well-equipped horse."[9] To achieve this there must be something other than the Attā who is to control the personal Attā. We find in a statement in *Paṇḍitabaggo* and a similar one in *Dandabaggo* saying, "As the channel-maker controls the flow of water, as the maker of the arrows controls the form of the arrow, as the carpenter controls the shape of the wood, so does the learned man control the Attā."[10] Once again, we must seek a self which learns and controls. Of course, we can still find a clue to our problem for we have seen

[5] *Arahantabaggo*-

[6] *Malabaggo*-3.

[7] *Cittabaggo*-9.

[8] *Jarābaggo*-3.

[9] *Vikkhubaggo*-21.

[10] *Paṇḍitabaggo*-5.

earlier that the stage for analytical knowledge according to the Buddha is the Mind. This Mind is said to be in the forefront of all Dhammas, so we may rightly accept the Mind as identified with self. We find a definite support for this view in the following words, "The Mind (Citta may be translated as 'will' instead of 'mind') is always restless in its efforts to escape from this Kingdom of Death, like a fish which has been taken out of the water and set upon the land."[11] Now, it is only natural to ask what exactly the Mind or Citta is. We can see that as long as we consider the mind as that which suffers action, we must accept it as purely material, for feeling belongs to the body and the organs of sense, and if the Mind be the sufferer it must be directly connected with these sense organs. If the Mind is identified with will, there is then room for controversy, for this identification of the Mind with the Will constitutes one of the greatest obstacles to a materialistic interpretation of human psychology. It has been considered by thinkers to be a spiritual faculty, but if we explain Will as the experience of Willing it no longer remains spiritual but becomes suffering of actions and reactions of bodily organisms. That we can explain Will as an experience may be demonstrated from the fact that "by applying appropriate stimuli we can cause people to have experiences which are exactly similar to the experience of willing freely."[12] In the *Dhammapada* Mind is compared with "the fort of a town"[13]. I cannot from any of the above descriptions of the Mind, comprehend its seperate existence and its ability to attain heaven or hell. If a human being can be described as the combination of body, mind and Attā then this being is no longer the same if any of the above constituents should change. As an impartial observer I am

---

[11] *Cittabaggo*-2.

[12] *The Mind and Its Working*, Ch. 2., Joad.

[13] *Cittabaggo*-8.

inclined to think that the origin of all these confusions lies in an incorrect conception of Space and Time and their relations to one another.

Perhaps we should undertake a more detailed study of Attā in Buddhism and compare it with its Sanskrit equivalent, Ātmā, of the Upaniṣads. For a definition of Ātmā we find in the *Gīta*, "Sense organs are superior to words, Mind is superior to sense organs, Intelligence (or Thinking) is superior to Mind and that which is superior to intelligence is the Ātmā."[14] In *Dhammapada* we don't find any such explicit definition of the Attā of a being. However, we find the relation of the Attā to the human being in the following verses :—"Sins which are committed by the Attā, started and completed by the Attā, shatter a fool as a piece of diamond can cut any jewel into fragments."[15] Thus, we see that the Attā is, so to speak, the primary subject of the human being. Of the Upaniṣadic Ātmā there is an origin, that is the Great-Ātma or the Brahma, but for the Buddhist Attā, we find "Attā is the lord of the Attā —who else can be its lord ?"[16] In the Upaniṣads the Ātmā and consequently, the Great-Atmā, is the Lord or the director of all actions of human beings. This is quite comprehensive if we accept, for the moment, the first statement. In the *Dhammapada*, however, there is no such coherence. Though the Attā is the subject of all sins from their beginning to their end, it is not the sole master of all actions. In the first verse of *Attābaggo* we are told that "knowing the Attā as the beloved, one should keep it well protected. At least one third of life should be spent in ritual for the protection of the Attā." Who, I ask, is going to love or know the master of the sinful deeds committed and yet not the master of the ritual acts recommended ? If Attā

---

[14] Third Chapter-42.

[15] *Attābaggo*-5.

[16] *Attābaggo*-4.

has to be protected by some other power how can it be said to be its own shelter and lord ? We do indeed find much inconsistency and incoherence in the conceptions of Buddhism. If Attā be self-contained how can it suffer from the reactions of something else ?

The Buddha has always maintained a distinction between two different types of actions, a distinction which appears at the beginning of this book. "Those who mistakenly consider worthless things to have value and things of value to be worthless, achieve nothing through their false impressions."[17] He has also declared which things are indeed worthless. However, he has not explained his reasons nor told us who is the judge. It seems that we must accept him as the final authority. Indirectly, the command appears thus, "To keep free from sin, to execute good work and remain pure at heart, are the orders of the Buddha".[18] In this connection it is said "The protection of the Buddha alone is safe and secure; by seeking that protection one can be free from all sorrows."[19] I wish to discuss this protection that we are promised. In one verse we find, "As a flood can sweep away a sleeping village, so can death sweep away the pickers of the flowers of love and lust."[20] Some one may well ask what will happen if the village is awake when the flood comes. Is it not swept away even so ? And if that be the case, may we not conclude that death will come whether we be lustful or not ? Why then should we take pains to check ourselves when we are drawn by the natural and instictive desires of the senses ? In another verse we find, "As the dirt generated in iron weakens the iron itself so the evil work of a man leads him to a bad end."[21] Again; we may very reasonably raise several ques-

[17] *Jamakabaggo*-11

[18] *Buddhabaggo*-5.

[19] *Buddhabaggo*-14.

[20] *Puffabaggo*-4.

[21] *Malabaggo*-6.

tions. Is it right to say that dirt, that is the rust, weakens iron, or is it not that the iron has become weak before the rust is formed? We must note also that the iron does not act to form rust--but only reacts. The action is that of an external agent. If the external agent intercourses with the iron it will have to react and that reaction can never be protected. Of course, it may be said that the rusting of the iron and the corresponding weakening of it are inter-dependent, just as the evil in the mind corresponds directly with its weakening. I cannot object to this suggestion but I would call attention to a remedy for these weakening effects and thus prove the inaccuracy of the *Dhammapada*. The suggested remedy is self—control; but what kind of self-control can the iron apply to prevent an external agent acting? It may put on a coat of paint, but in so doing it is taking help of a second external agent. Now let us examine the type of self control proposed for men. "He who does not believe in others, who knows the unborn, who has broken all ties, who is beyond worries and beyond desires–that person is perfect."[22] It would seem that this self-protected man must not have faith in any external agent, must not associate himself with anything, must not even concern himself with any process of self-protection. To go back to the analogy of the iron, I ask, how is he going to put on a coat then? The dialectics of the Buddha goes completely down in this.

Two very interesting points can be noted in the following three verses occurring consecutively. "There has never existed and will never exist a man who is worthy of nothing but praise, nor one who merits nought but blame. If some man of considerable intelligence should choose to praise somebody, day after day, as faultless, clever, understanding and well-mannered, then no one can degrade him, just as a gold coin cannot be debased. Even the

[22] *Arahambbhabaggo*-8.

Gods praise him and Brahma admires him."[23] I don't understand that if no one can be entirely without fault, how can an intelligent man act as though it were possible ? The other point of interest is that the Buddha seems to accept gold as universally praised and incorruptible, i.e., he recognises the importance of materialistic things to man. This shows that he is forced to erect an unnatural barrier between man and his instinctive reactions before he can declare, "If you look upon this world as you look upon a water bubble or a mirage, death will never look upon you."[24] The whole of the *Dhammapada* is full of such discrepancies.

Dhammapada seems to advocate a form of escapism, but this type of escapism is not possible, and can only be comprehended in the light of a feeling of frustration, as will be seen from the following: "The good man abandons everything, the saint never talks of things which attract, he is never overwhelmed with joy or in sorrow, when they come."[25] The Buddha thinks that men can escape joy or sorrow if they sever all connections with the world. But there can be no logical support for this principle of escape and abandonment, for how far can we go in our desire for escape ? If we seek the woods, the mountains, the sea or even the sky, in all cases we will have to depend on some material objects for our existence. Without these we could not live. Thus the principle of escape as suggested by the Buddha may be said to resolve itself into the simple abandoning of responsibility for others while still deriving help and support from them. What then would happen if every one succeeded in shaking off his responsibilities and no one was left to shoulder them ? What end can be achieved by this Buddhistic conception of mankind at its perfect form ? If we have to put aside the question of the prac-

---

[23] *Kodhabaggo*-8, 9. 10.

[22] *Lokabaggo*-4.

[45] *Panditabaggo*-8.

tical application of this principle, then, what ideal is it that we must imagine ? Turning from the ideal to the theoretical, can the Buddha find any justification for a man's delegating his responsibilities to another ? And can he possibly do this ? Why then is it said, "Detachment is above all the best, endurance is the method of achieving it and Nibbāna is final."[26] It is obvious from the questions mentioned above that this type of statements can only frighten people to the point of frustration. These are not answers of our questions but are admissions of defeat, otherwise we would not be advised to avoid or bear troubles which are felt only in dire frustration. The instinctive method is to select ways and means which promise the least stress, not with a view to escaping from the things which attract us and bearing troubles, but to attain those things which attract us with least trouble possible.

Such are the teachings of the great religion of Buddhism. I see no point in selecting yet more examples, for I believe that I have indicated most of the different types of inaccuracies in the Buddhist ethics. I esteem the Buddha's personality and his honest and intense search for an answer to man's problems, but how many people can accept his conclusions ? There is much to be criticised in his inaccurate and incomplete study of nature and in his biased reasoning. And one must not ignore the psychological factor which is present throughout his reasoning. Gautama's early life affects his attitude throughout his teachings. He was very young when he left home, and no doubt suffered a great deal in his search after knowledge. May we not find here the underlying cause for his principle of abandonment and endurance ? He came from an aristocratic family, and the effect of this background may be traced in his work, for he did not believe that all men can attain the same heights, whether they wish it or not. He says,

---

[36] *Buddhabaggo*-6.

"This world is full of darkness, it is given to very few to be able to see clearly; very few can ascend to heaven like a bird freed from a mesh."[27] Again, he says, "Great men are not easily found. They are not born everywhere. The family in which such a person is born is very fortunate."[82] According to the Buddha, manhood does not attain a perfect form, but only by good fortune or luck. Apart from those few who had been endowed with good fortune, man must walk in darkness and find no relief from his troubles. We find then, that Buddha's soultions are not solutions of problems as such, but merely good advice on a method of seeking happiness by means of superiority complex.

---

[27] *Lokabaggo*-8.

[28] *Buddhabaggo*-15.

SOME PRINCIPLES OF TRACING PRE-PĀNINIAN PORTIONS IN PĀṆINIAN WORKS

By Ram Shankar Bhattacharya

(1)

It is a universally admitted fact that in India, each system of thought, before coming into light to its present form in a very sharp and broad outline, remains in a seedy and potential state and according to the development of proofs and the knowable categories, pertaining to that particular line of thought, the system gradually takes its definite shape with a solidity and distinctive character by works of the exponents and afterwards the system runs as a distinctive science.

This principle is common to all the philosophies and Grammar (व्याकरण) as well. The origin of these systems is involved in obscurity and it may easily be presumed that before the works of the level-headed persons like Gotama and Kaṇāda etc., many short or large treatises were composed and the above named sages gave the sciences a very sharp and distinct character by establishing the doctrines comprehensively.

But in the composing of these inter-related and inter-dependent works, each scholar would obviously come under the influence of his predecessors and it may aptly be said that later works are but developed forms of those of the predecessors. Developing does not mean that the later works will necessarily be larger in forms, but (1) it will satisfy the requirement regarding the conceptual stage of that time, (2) its expressions will be more elaborate and fruitful[1] and

[1]Sometimes Pāṇini tried to ridicule his formers, as is shown by *Prakriyā Sarvasva* and *Padamañjarī* (Vol. I page 38).

(3) it will be without defects or logical fallacies whatsoever.[2]

Here a fact is to be emphasised : In systems like Nyāya etc., in which the subject matter is to be dealt with and expounded at large, whether by establishing the categories advocated by his Teachers or by refuting the views of the opponents, later exponents accepting only the senses and the subject matter (dealt with by the predecessor), endeavour to develop their systems by composing new works, but in this peculiar system of Grammar, later scholars not only will have to accept the senses and the subject matter, but also the terms and propositions, used by the formers, because in this particular system, words are regarded as objects and proofs as well, according to the famous dictum : शब्दप्रमाणका वयं यच्छब्द आह तदेवास्माकं प्रमाणम् ; hence, it may reasonably be said that much portions of the later works in Grammar are in-corporated from the works of the predecessors. According to this rule, we may say that much portions of Pāṇini's works are also written by his predecessors, whose works were accepted by Pāṇini as authoritative.

Some may raise the objection that Pāṇini's works are results of his intuition (उपज्ञा) as is clear from the statement —पाणिनिनोपज्ञातं पाणिनीयं व्याकरणम्[3], hence how can it be said that he accepted even the words of his predecessors. Is the composition of a new grammar, with a new character (अकालकं व्याकरणम्[4]) not a direct proof of his unwillingness to the doctrines of his formers ? Our answer is in the negative, because : (1) Pāṇini designated his work as 'शब्दानुशासन' which means that he dealt with the matter already dealt with by the predecessors (शिष्टस्य शासनमनुशासनम्);

---

[2]From *Nyāsa* (1 1 42) we understand that Pāṇini knew that there are some defects in the works of his predecessors, and this is why he composed a new treatise.

[3] *Kāśikā* 4. 3. 115.

[4] Cf. the remarks of *Kāśikā* on 4. 2. 14.

(2) In many Sūtras he put the names of his predecessors and in some places words like आचार्याणाम्. Had he possessed any indifference towards his predecssors, he would not have mentioned the names. but the terms like वा, एके etc. which he had also done in some places. The पूजार्थनामग्रहण (accepting of proper names for *honoris-causa*)—is aslo a clear proof of his following the footprints of his predecessors. (3) Moreover, in old commentaries, we find clear statements[5] by which our assumptions become proved.

Now the purpose for a new composition is to be discussed. We think that the reason for which all the Smṛtis came into being after the composition of the universally accepted *Manusmṛti* is also the cause of Pāṇini's new work. It may also be presumed that pre-Pāṇini n works were also larger in forms with unnecessary details[6] and Pāṇini made a rational compendium of these, which was necessary for the intellectual development of that time. This view is supported by the oft-quoted sayings like युगे युगे व्याकरणात् etc.[7] Moreover, I venture to think that Pāṇini's own purpose was to prepare the grammatical faculties in such a scientific manner by which all fruitless and defective portions may come in disuse and new Verbal Usages would also be justified. If any one cares to compare without prejudice the distinguishing features of Pāṇini with those of his predecessors he would come to the said conclusion.[8]

It may be asked : Why did Pāṇini accept the terms and propositions used by his predecessors ? The answer

---

[5] अथवा पूर्वसूत्रनिर्देशोऽयम् (Vide *Bhāṣya* on 7. 1. 18).
यक्तिवचने इति च लिंगसंख्येयोः पूर्वाचार्यनिर्देशः, तदीयमेवेदं सूत्रम् (*Kāśikā* 1. 2. 51)

[6] See व्याकरण शास्त्र का इतिहास by Y. Mimansaka.

[7] Cf. the remark of Bhattoji in शब्दकौस्तुभ on 1. 1. 27.

[8] I have already dealt with the special features of Pāṇini in comparision with those of his predecessors in a separate paper published in the *Sanskritam*, A Sanskrit Magazine of Ayodhya.

is that by accepting the pre-existing usages, the students will find less obstacle and they will have to spend less energy and time in becoming familiar with these terms. Moreover in Sanskrit Literature we often find a tendency of using words already used by the predecessors. An example of this notion may be found in the *Bhāṣya* on the *Vārtika*:[9] सिद्धे शब्दार्थसंबन्धे where Patañjali expressly told us that the use of the term सिद्ध is according to the use of "संग्रह" a compilation work on Pāṇinian system by Vyāḍi. Moreover many commentators attributed some aphorisms of Pāṇini to his predecessors directly. Hence, we can take it as an established fact that there are portions of the predecessors in the works of Pānini which may be distinguished and separated by proper principles.

Before describing the principles of tracing pre-Pāṇinian portions, it is to be understood by all that all the pre-Pāṇinian Grammatical works have almost been lost and we[10] get at present some stray sayings quoted in different commentaries of great or less authority. Opinions of pre-Pāṇinian Ācāryas are also referred to by later works. It is also clear that the authors, who quoted the words of ancient authorities, may not have actually seen the works of pre-Pāṇinian Teachers but they got these sayings through their tradition (सम्प्रदाय), which cannot preserve the actual sayings for a very long period.[11] Under these circumstances, it is very difficult to verify our results with the pre-Pāṇinian works. I will prove my results by inference and adequate remarks of past scholars.

---

[9] पस्पशाह्निक

[10] See *Structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī.*

[11] Though the writer has enough faith in Indian tradition for its power of preserving Truths for a long period, yet there are plenty of examples by which it can be proved that the later exponents quoted the sayings of the formers not in the same form actually. This is a clear fact which should be accepted without prejudice.

(II)

Now the question arises : Is there any way by which it may be deemed as how much portions in Pāṇinian-works are copied from the works of his predecessors or had Pāṇini left any sign by which his loan may be ascertained ? No doubt this is a very grave question. The following pages are meant to deal with this question briefly.

First Principle—If any one can ascertain the style of any author, then he can say easily how many portions are imitated by the author from the works of the formers, which is inevitable for any author of any science. We are fortunate enough that we get some statements which describe the style of Pāṇini. Patañjali speaks of a peculiar tendency of Pāṇini as under—एषा हि आचार्यस्य शैली लक्ष्यते यत् तुल्यजातीयान् तुल्यजातीयेषु उपदिशति, अचोऽक्षु हलो हल्षु[12] Here Ācārya means Pāṇini[13]. This shows that Pāṇini had a habit of compiling rules of the same character (तुल्यजातीय) at one place. From this statement we can plainly draw the conclusion that if in any place of entire Pāṇinian works, compiled categories differ in character (जाति), then that particular portion is absolutely non-Pāṇinian, i.e. Pāṇini had copied that very portion from the works of his predecessors. It will be grave consideration to determine the portions where categories of different characters have been compiled in *Aṣṭādhyāyī* [14] but one capital example is being set here from Pāṇini's *Dhātupāṭha*. Here unaccented root क्षि is read with the accented roots.[15] Now, according to our said rule, we can attribute

---

[12] Vide *Bhāṣya* on हयवरट् सूत्र (आह्निक २)

[13] Nāgeśa Bhaṭṭa says in *Udyota* that here Ācārya means अनादिः शब्दपुरुषः which is quite wrong, because in the *Māhābhāṣya* Ācārya always means Pāṇini.

[14] Vide my Sanskrit Paper 'अष्टाध्यायी—प्रकरण—क्रमालोचनम्' in सारस्वतीसुषमा a magazine of Govt. Sanskrit College, Banaras.

[15] Vide *Dhātupāṭha* Root No 236

F. 13

this portion to pre-Pāṇinian Ācāryas, because this is a portion where categories of different characters are compiled. My readers will be astonished to know that Kṣīraswāmī, a famous commentator on the *Dhātupāṭha*,[16] had ascribed such portions as being written due to पूर्वाचार्यानुरोध (deference to the former Ācāryas).

Here we can also say that if we can compile sentences describing the style of Pāṇini, then we can easily determine how many portions were composed by Pāṇini. It is said that विशेषः पाणिनेरिष्टः सामान्यं सर्ववर्मणः [17] i.e. Pāṇini was fond of special rules and Sarvavarman, author of the *Kātantra*, of general rules. Can this sentence help us to determine Pāṇini's own Sūtras ? Can it be said that most of the विशेषसूत्रs (special rules) are composed by Pāṇini ? Sometimes modern commentators also note the style of Pānini as is clear from the statement आचार्यशैली वा (*Śabdaratna* on 7. 2. 22, *Proudha Manoramā* of Haridīkṣit.)

Second Principle—Pānini was very fond of brevity (लाघव), hence, it can be admitted that Pāṇini would not use any sort of finite verbs. If at any time, it is admitted that some verbs are essential, it can yet be boldly said that verbs like अस्ति, भजति etc., are quite useless in a sūtra. If such useless finite verbs are used in any sūtra, then that sutra should be attributed to pre-Pāṇinian Ācāryas. Thus योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनं स्यात्[18] should be a pre-Pāṇinian sūtra. Had it been written by Pāṇini, it would have been written as योगप्रमाणे च तदभावेऽदर्शनात्, as is done in sutra : लुब्-योगाप्रख्यानात्.[19]

A second instance of this kind may be found in the sutra : कृञ्चानुप्रयुज्यते लिटि.[20] According to the style of Pāṇini,

---

[16] The writer of this article is editing this work, and it will be published shortly.

[17] Vide Durgādāsa's commentary on the *Mugdhabodha*, sutra 920.

[18] 1 2 55.

[19] 1 2 54.

[20] 3 1 40.

it should have been written as : 'कृञोऽनुप्रयोगो लिटि. Such sūtras are to be attributed to such Acaryas as used finite verbs in their aphoristic sayings. In this particular case, it may also be deemed that अनुप्रयोगघटित प्रयोग were of recent origin, and व्यस्तप्रयोग were common from ancient time, hence Pāṇini expressed his notion in the present tense (प्रयुज्यते).

Third Principle—It may be deemed that opinions of the ancient Ācāryas were denoted by Pāṇini in the same form as were written by the Ācāryas themselves.[21] In the sūtra वासुप्यापिशलेः,[22] we can say that Ācārya Āpiśali also wrote his aphoristic saying as वा सुपि or at least these two words were present in his sūtra of this kind. If it is accepted as a true fact,[23] then we can say that प्रत्याहार सुप् is pre-Pāṇinian.

In this connection we can recall a परिभाषा of Pāṇini's predecessors : गतिकारकोपपदानां कृद्भिः सह समासवचनं प्राक् सुबुत्पत्तेः where सुप्-प्रत्याहार is used. This is also a direct proof of the pre-Pāṇinian existence of the प्रत्याहार सुप्. Here we can also say that all the words in this परिभाषा are also pre-Pāṇinian and hence, sūtras relating to them may also be pre-Pāṇinian mostly in their forms.

Such results may also be drawn from the opinions of other Ācāryas quoted in *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. From the sūtra

---

[21]This view is also accepted by the learned author of the *Structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

[22] 6. 1. 92.

[23]All authors of Sanskrit language use the term इति before any proper name, written to quote one's opinion, and the name is written in the nominative case as अवस्थितेरिति काशकृत्स्नः (Ved. Sū. 1.4.22) इन्द्रियनित्यं वचनमित्यौदुम्बरायणः (*Nirukta*) अविवेकनिमित्त इति पञ्चशिखः (*Sāṅkhya Sūtra* 6th ch.). Pāṇini had ignored that style totally. He writes as ओतोगार्ग्यस्य(8. 3. 21) and not ओत इति गार्ग्यः I think that this peculiarity has a clear significance i.e. Pāṇini, when quoting others' opinions, took the actual words as far as possible and not the opinions only. The term इति denotes mere opinion, and this is why he rejected it. Moreover, it is also to be understood that in Philosophical systems, sense may be conveyed even through different words, but in Grammar mere terms are also of great importance. Hence Pāṇini rejected the word इति only to denote that he not only is quoting the opinion but as far as possible the words also. This problem is discussed at length in my Hindi Paper ' स्वप्रमाणभूत आचार्यों के प्रति पाणिनि का मनोभाव'.

अड् गार्ग्यगालवयोः[24], it can be said that the word अट् was also used by Gārgya and Gālava. Hence we can draw the conclusion that आद्यन्तौ टकितौ[25] is also a pre-Pāṇinian sūtra. Similarly in accordance with the sūtra ओतो गार्ग्यस्य[26] we can say that तपरस्तत्कालस्य[27] is also a pre-Pāṇinian aphorism.

If we consider the sūtras in which some predecessors' names are written, in the manner described above, then we can get plenty of materials regarding pre-Pāṇinian Grammars. Here the principle is only discussed by which scholars may draw results from all such sūtras.

Fourth Principle—It may be said that the sūtras, in which no विभक्ति is operated, are pre-Pāṇinian, because Pāṇini, who is celebrated as सुहृद्भूत्वाऽऽचार्योऽन्वाचष्टे would not use such अविभक्तिक (without case-endings) words as is done in the sūtra एकतण्डिते च[28] etc. It is a sūtra copied from those Ācāryas, who also used such अविभक्तिक terms in their works.

Similarly, we can say that sūtras in which अन्यथाविभक्तिक words are used are also pre-Pāṇinian. It is not at all understood why Pāṇini should use such improper case-endings. We find many examples of this type in Vedic literature, and hence, it can be rightly conceived that such uses were common in those Grammatical works which were composed in such ancient period, because at that time scholars were familiar with such improper case-endings. If it is accepted as a true fact, then such sūtras[29] will obviously be pre-Pāṇinian. Examples of this principle are to be found in sūtras 3-3-96,3-4-97 etc.

---

[24] 7. 3. 99.
[25] 1. 1. 21.
[26] 8. 3. 20.
[27] 1. 1. 70.
[28] 6. 3. 62.
[29] Similarly we can say that the sūtra, in which there is a 'fault of गौरव' is surely a pre-Pāṇinian. Pāṇini had not used any letter without any significance, and wherever he left brevity he showed some परिभाषा etc. as ज्ञापकसिद्ध through the गौरवस्थल of his sūtra. Therefore, we can say that if we can find any गौरवयुक्त sūtra without any inner significance then that sūtra has surely a pre-Pāṇinian origin.

It is a common fact that प्रत्ययविधि should follow पंचमी विभक्ति. But there are many sūtras where षष्ठी विभक्ति is used in place of पञ्चमी विभक्ति. The learned author of the book *Structure of Aṣṭādhyāyī*, had assigned such sūtras as pre-Pāṇinian. But it is not definite who was that Ācārya whose sūtras are being copied by Pāṇini when he used षष्ठी विभक्ति in place of पञ्चमी विभक्ति. Here I can say that the tradition, recalled by Pāṇini aṣ प्राचां, used such sūtras in its works, which can directly be proved from the sūtra कुषिरजोः प्राचां श्यन् परस्मैपदं च[30]. I have already told that Pāṇini quoted the opinions of his predecessors through the same words, as were written by them. Hence, it is clear that प्राग् Tradition used कुषिरजोः in the षष्ठी विभक्ति though it should be पञ्चमी विभक्ति according to Pāṇini's process.

Fifth Principle—Metrical sūtras are also to be designated as pre-Pāṇinian. It is a clear fact that all sorts of works are written in verses in India, even sciences like Mathematics also. Some ancient works on Grammar, written in verses, are yet available. Had Pāṇini liked that poetry-style, he would also have composed his work in verses. Denying that famous style is a clear proof that 'metrical sūtras'[31] are not composed by Pāṇini himself but are copied from the works in which metrical sūtras were written. Though it is also a common fact that sometimes prose-like expressions become verses by chance, yet this reason cannot be applicable to all the metrical sūtras of *Aṣṭādhyāyī*.

Sixth Principle—It is found that one word is used in different senses in different sūtras causing thereby

---

[30] 3. 1. 90.

[31] The famous metrical sūtra in Aṣṭd. is 'हरतेर्दृतिनाथयोः पशौ' (3. 2. 25), which is in वैतालीय Metre. There are very few instances of metrical sūtras. If any work is written in verses, then some useless words will also be accepted for metrical purposes, which Pāṇini, lover of brevity, could not accept. Haradatta, commenting on the *Kāśikā* 7. 1. 18. showed one capital example of such fault.

misunderstanding in determining the correct meaning of a word. The term ऋतु is used in various senses in different sūtras[32] and the word अमनुष्य in various senses.[33] In such places correct meaning cannot be understood without any external help. The reason of such perplexing use is this that Pāṇini utilised all the works of his former Ācāryas, and each Ācārya, used a term for one sense, though the same term was used by a second Ācārya in a different sense (which is quite possible and common), and because Pāṇini used the words also used by his predecessors, hence in Pāṇinian works, we find one word in various senses. Because in Pāṇini's time pre-used words were in vogue and because Pāṇini thought that व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम्, hence he did not hesitate to use one word in different senses.[34]

Seventh .Principle—It is a common fact that one Technical Term is enough to denote one single sense and no author uses two Technical Terms for one particular sense generally in one work on one subject. Many terms for one Technical sense are direct proofs that those terms are invented by various Ācāryas. It is quite needless for one Ācārya to use various technical terms for one single sense, whereas we see in *Aṣṭd.* that the terms वा, विभाषा, अन्यतरस्याम् etc. are used in one single sense. Patañjali submitted his reason for such use as सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम्; तत्र नैकः पन्थाः शक्य आस्थातुम् We think that various Technical Terms are used by various Ācāryas, and because their terms became familiar in Pāṇini's time, hence Pāṇini accepted those terms.

Mr. Pawate thinks that many non-Technical words for one sense also denote that such sūtras are not written

---

[32] Vide sūtras 4. 2. 60, 4. 3. 68.

[33] Vide sūtras 2. 4. 23, 3. 2. 53.

[34] I have dealt with this problem in my Sanskrit Book 'श्रीमद्भगवत्पाणिनिसम्मतसूत्रार्थनिर्णयः' to be published shortly.

by one author. But this may not be true, because in our verbal usages we use many non-technical terms for one sense and none can question if one learned author uses more than one word for one single sense. But this rule varies in the case of Technical Terms.

Pāṇini had adopted various ways to operate one single action. To denote गणपाठ he used various ways e.g. (1) using the term आदि (2) using the term प्रभृति (3) using बहुवचन (plural number) and (4) using the word इति in different sūtras. Are these four separate styles invented by Pāṇini alone? I think that many styles are direct proofs regarding their adoption by different Ācāryas. But now it is quite impossible to ascertain as to which of these styles should be attributed to Pāṇini and which to his predecessors.

Eighth Principle—There are some sutras in which some words are used without any adequate result, and commentators observe that such words are not fruitful in that sūtra in which the word exists and the word is उत्तरार्थ i.e. it has significance in later sūtras.[35] Such sūtras cannot be Pāṇinian at all. These sūtras may be pre-Pāṇinian and such fruitless words had proper significance in ancient works also. As the style of Pāṇini for the composition of a new work is different from that of his predecessors, and in spite of this, if he accepts sūtras of his Teachers, then it is clear that in his composition all words would not bear proper significance.

There are some peculiar words in certain sūtras, for the justification of which सौत्रोऽयं निर्देशः (this corrupt form of the word is correct as it is used in the sūtra by the Ācārya) is said by the commentators.[36] Such kinds of sūtras are also to be designated as pre-Pāṇinian, as there is no justification

---

[35] Vide *Bhāṣya* on 3. 1. 107.

[36] Vide *Bhāṣya* on 3. 4. 60 etc.

for such uncommon use in a book written in popular speech (लौकिकभाषा). In ancient times such kinds of usages were common and hence, it is quite reasonable that sūtras with such words are w ritten by pre-Pāṇinian Ācāryas and Pāṇini accepted them as he was personally very fond of such usages.

With the help of the principles described above, one can easily ascertain the real gift of Ācārya Panini. We have only discussed about the pre-Pāninian materials, but we should accept that Pāṇini had also applied his own intellect for composing a new work. Obviously Pāṇini had introduced many new features which were not incorporated in the works of his Acaryas. Until and unless we will be able to ascertain the actual work of Pānini, it is useless to inquire about pre-Paninian materials in Pānini's works. We will deal with this particular point in future.

NINE GEMS OF THE COURT OF MAHĀRĀJĀ BHĀVASIṀHA OF REWĀ

By A. H. Nizami

In his *Descriptive Catalogue* of the Saṁskrit Manuscripts in the collections of the *Asiatic Society of Bengal*, Vol. VII Mahāmahopādhyāya Haraprasāda Shāstri notices a Ms. of Somadeva's *Kathāsaritsāgara*[1] to which are appended 100 ślokas, on the genealogy and courtiers of the patron of the scribe who says, in the post colophon statement, in the first part of the *Kathā*. text that the transcription of that part was done by Rūpaṇi Śarmā at the instance of "King Śrī Bhāvasiṁha." Again, he says that Bhāvasiṁha acquired from Kāśmīra a copy of the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, got it revised by court scholars and transcribed by Rūpaṇi Śarmā[2] who added these verses of his own composition for the entertainment of "courtiers, Brāhmaṇs (as well as of) Bhāvasiṁha"[3] "on the full moon day of the bright half of Bhādra in the year 1735 of the Vikrama era" (A.D. 1678). The present manuscript, the only known copy, would seem to be dated Saṁvat 1869 A.D. 1812 (Post Colophon in the second part of the *Kathā* text.) The genealogical verses, printed *verbatim* in the catalogue under reference[4] were first brought to the notice of scholars by the late Dr. Ḥar Dutta Sharma[5] and utilized by the present writer for his paper on the '*Genealogical Sources of the Baghela Dynasty of Rewā*', submitted to the 9th *Indian History Congress*, Annamalainagar, December, 1945[6]. The verses were paraphrased into Hindi

---

[1] No. 5398.

[2] Sloka 88.

[3] S. 98.

[4] pp. 309-22.

[5] Krishnaswami Commemoration Volume, pp. 48-54.

[6] Proceedings pp. 150-53.

by Pandit Nand Kishore Post-Ācharya in 1938 for Shri (Rai Bahadur) Brajendranath Chaturvedi then Finance Minister, Rewa State. This translation has been thoroughly revised and recast for the Baghelkhand (now Vindhya) *Historical Records Commission* by my friend, Pandit Chintamani Malaviya, M. A., who has also prepared an English summary on which the present paper is based. The verses are awaiting publication by the Commission as '*Vaghela Vaṅśaṁ*' with translation, introduction and notes, on behalf of the Government of Vindhya Pradesh.

With the publication of the *Vīrabhanudaya*[7] scholars are now well-acquainted with the early genealogy of the illustrious Baghela house of Rewa which is the most authentic and earliest known account as given in that Kāvya. Here we are not concerned with the origin of the Baghelas of Rewā which Rūpaṇi traces back to Karṇadeva of Gujarāt. The fourth scion of the family after Karṇa, Viśāladeva, rose to fame under the Bhar king of Kāliñjar.[8] This corresponds to a well-known tradition also recorded in later State genealogies by the Khāsqalams of the Rewa court who, for the first time, introduce Vyāghradeva (Bāgh Rāo of the Gujaratī chroniclers) as the anonymous hero of the Baghela clan immediately prior to Karṇadeva.

The son of Vīrabhānu (the hero of the *Vīrabhānūdaya*), being the namesake of Lord Rāmachandra of Ayodhyā (lit. invincible), the killer of Rāvaṇa of Laṅkā, seems to have offered an excellent subject for the exercise of poetic fancy. As many as twenty-two stanzas,[9] devoted by Rūpaṇi to this celebrated ruler, remind us of a contemporary account in the *Vīrabhadra Campū* of Padmanābha Miśra.[10] Like

---

[7] Under the authority of Rewa Durbar at the Newal Kishore Press, Lucknow, 1938.

[8] Ś. 12.

[9] 37-58.

[10] I, 7-8, 16; V, 1, 6-28.

Padmanābha again, Rūpaṇi extols in ten of these verses[11] the loftiness of the Bāndhava-giri held by Rāmachandra adding, likewise, that the sacred Prayāga was included in his dominions.[12] Rūpaṇi refers, besides, in five verses, to "the kings' city" (Rāmanagar) "in the vicinity of Bāndhava"[13], which may be identified with Rāmpur, five miles to the east. The retirement of Rāmachandra (by far the greatest Baghela ruler) from his capital, Gahora (Karvī tahsīl of Bāndā district, United Provinces), to Bāndhavagarh[14] during the latter half of his reign[15] gave it a political and strategical importance and a reputation for invincibility so that 'Bāndhogaṛh' has ever since remained the proud possession of the Baghelas. To the Mughal historians the Baghela was 'Zamīndār-i-Bāndho' and bards and court poets continued to style him as 'Bāndhopati' or Bāndhavesh even after Rewā had become the capital in the time of Vikramāditya,[16] the great-grand-father of Bhāvasiṁha, the patron of Rūpaṇi.

Bhāvasiṁha (1675-94) 'the lord of Bāndhava' and the ruler of Rewā was born of Anūpasiṁha's queen, Kamalā (second Ranī)[17] in Saṁ. 1707=1650 A.D. He was a prince —handsome, accomplished and generous, whom Rūpaṇi gives the proud credit of sheltering the needy in the difficult times of the Age of Kali and the suzerainty of the Yavana lord of Dillī, chastiser of the 'twice-born'.[18] The emperor was, however, friendly to Bhāvasiṁha, as Rūpaṇi would have us believe[19] for we know that Bhāvasiṁha's father, Anūpasiṁha (1651-75), was a 3-hazārī

[11] 40-49.
[12] Ś. 55-58.
[13] Ś. 50-54.
[14] V. Campū I, 16
[15] C. 1577.
[16] Circa 1602.
[17] Sirnetin: *State Genealogies*.
[18] Ś. 77.
[19] Ś 75.

mansabdār who had rendered meritorious services to the imperial arms and Aurangzeb, whose preoccupations at this period were increasing, and who would be loth to meddle with the placid contentment of a loyal vassal. But the irresistible pressure of Chatrasāl Bundela, the bold and audacious defier of imperial authority, had forced the Baghelas to retire into the shell of self defence and Rewā was hard put to it, for half a century, to prevent territorial encroachments at the hands of the Bundelas. The boundary of Rewā State in 1678 had, therefore, shrunk on the north-west to what Rūpani defines[20] after the chiefs of Kothī, Nāgod and Sohāwal had all but acceded to Pannā and the Baghela hold over Gahorā must have been precarious. The Rewā house was well-connected by marriage during this period. Of the nine odd queens of Anūpasiṁha one was a daughter of Rāo Śatrusāl Hāḍā of Būndī and among his own daughters, one had been given in marriage to Kunwar Rāmāsiṁha, heir-apparent of Mirzā Rājā Jaisiṁha Kachwāhā of Āmber. Of Bhāvasiṁha's own marriages—nineteen odd—the first was concluded with Ajab Kunwari, daughter of Rāṇā Rājasiṁha of Udaipur, while his own daughter, Mahālachhmī, was given away to Kunwar Sūrajmal, heir of the Rāṇā's son, Rājā Bhīmasiṁha, founder of the Banerā Rāj. Yet these dynastic marriages were of no avail against misfortune which never comes alone. Bhāvasiṁha had no son and the adoption of the second son of his next brother, Thākura of Semariā, gave rise to a succession dispute which contributed, not a little, to the future disintegration of the State. This adopted youth, Aniruddhasiṁha, met with a fatal accident when his heir-apparent, Avadhūta, was not even one year old at a time when the power of Pannā was at its zenith, the Bundela aggression culminating in the siege of Rewā by Hirde Sāh and its temporary

---

[20] Ś. 78.

occupation. All this befell after the death of Bhāvasiṁha, nevertheless his uneventful reign marks the post-meridian of the Baghela sun of power. Bhāvasiṁha's own sense of frustration would seem to have found solace, on the one hand, in his poligamous zeal and, on the other hand, in his devotion to religion (performance of sacrifices, building of temples, consecration of images) and patronage of Brāhmaṇa scholars like those praised in such fulsome style by Rūpaṇi Śarmā. That Bhāvasiṁha was a "foremost devotee of Rāma"[21] and a propitiator of fire[22] accords well with his reputation as an orthodox Vaiṣṇava for whose protection Rūpaṇi specially invokes the blessings, besides the usual gods, of Vindhyavāsinī, the titulary goddess of the Vindhya country.

What we are concerned with in this paper are the nine courtiers of Bhāvasiṁha whom Rūpaṇi takes special pains to eulogise—six scholars, one personal servant, one capitalist, and one minister. His notices[23] are summarized below in the order followed by him, our purpose being to introduce to the readers the scholars patronized by Bhāvasiṁha who is said to have been himself "expert in poetry, narrative and arts"[24] and "a protector of good men."[25]

1. *Bālakrishna*, prince among scholars, was well versed in the various branches of learning, ocean of courage, generosity, profundity and gentle nature, unique in beauty, expert in discrimination and showerer of the nectar of speech.[26]

---

[21] S. 65.

[22] S. 78.

[23] S. 81-89.

[24] S. 90.

[25] S. 78.

[26] S. 81.

2. *Kishora*, was a 'Cakora' (partridge) to the moon-like knowledge, winner of the hearts of distinguished scholars, string to the gems of profound erudition and gentility and free from impiety.[27]

3. *Govardhana Vajapeyī*, with a fancy for ornaments, was devoted to literature, and well versed in Logic.[28]

4. *Lālamaṇi*, foremost among the western Gauḍas, casket to the gem-like knowledge, ocean of gentleness and praiseworthy courage, nectar-tongued, Bṛhaspati in intellect, well up in the lore of the *Sāmaveda*, learned in the 'Kauthuma' school of *Chāndogya* (Upaniṣad), a devotee of Hari, was a favourite of the king.[29]

5. *Aupagavi*, another favourite, was a thunderbolt to the mountain of disputants, excelling poets in his wealth of speech, Bhāravi in poetic genius, propitiator of fire by his daily offerings, and lion to roam about through the forest of literature and learning.[30]

6. *Kamalanayana*, the southern scholar, drunk deep in the entire Vedic knowledge, foremost among good men, of noble parentage, benefactor of others, was skilled in all the arts and crafts.[31]

7. *Gopīnātha*, unprecendentedly rich, desired, as it were, to gain a hold over the king by his merits and by conduct pleasing to the king.[32]

8. *Kodū*, the betel-keeper, foremost in putting off the royal armour, with his desires fulfilled on

---

[27] S. 82.
[28] S. 83.
[29] S. 94.
[30] S. 85.
[31] S. 86.
[32] S. 87.

account of his being extremely beloved, was a friend of the king.[33]

9. *Jaganmaṇi*, among the ministers, was sun to the lotus-like subjects, amulet of protection to the king, pursuer of wholesome policy, foremost among the wise, effulgent like the sun, ornament to the earth by his protection of the people.

A preliminary survey of records, made in Rewā town by the Baghelkhand (now Vindhya) *Historical Records Commission* has revealed the existence of the descendants of most of these scholars of Bhāvasiṁha's court but no literary production from their pen has so far come to light.

[33] S. 88.

Audit Report of the Ganganatha Jha Research Institute For 1950-51.

Income	Rs.	a.	p.	Expenditure	Rs.	a.	p.
1. Annual Membership	322	4	0	General Expenditure	2,408	15	0
2. Life Membership	150	0	0	General Postage account	21	6	9
3. Sales account	183	13	0	Journal Postage etc. account	3,469	6	0
4. Donations	6,200	0	0	Book Binding account	169	12	0
5. Interest account	6,190	12	0	Research scholarship	1,850	0	0
Refund of advance	3,523	0	0	Building Expenditure	4,501	2	0
				Purchase of Books	93	0	0
				Purchase of Manuscripts	514	0	0
				Advance ...	82	7	0
Total ...	16,569	13	0	Total ...	13,110	0	9
				Closing Balance: Bank ... 3,590 2 2; Cash ... 5 13 9	3,595	15	11
Opening balance ...	136	3	8				
Grand Total ...	16,706	0	8	Grand Total ...	16,706	0	8

Liabilities	Rs.	a.	p.	Assets	Rs.	a.	p.
Due Expenditure	345	1	0	Furniture	1,784	12	3
Balance on 31st March, 1951	1,45,934	15	3	Manuscripts	1,614	0	0
				Books	93	0	0
				Advance	82	7	0
				Securites invested	1,37,529	13	1
				Securities deposited	180	0	0
				National Saving certificates	1,500	0	0
				Cash in Bank	3,590	2	2
				Cash at hand	5	13	9
Total ...	1,46,280	0	3	Total ..	1,46,280	0	3

(Sd.) N. M. MUKERJI
Accounts Officer, Allahabad.

YEAR'S WORK IN MODERN INDIAN LANGUAGE STUDIES

Bengali After 1948—No. 2.

By Amar Mukerji

Ravindra Jivani O Rabindrasahitya Praveshak, Vol. 2 : by Prabhat Kumar Mukhopadhyaya; Visva-Bharati Granthalaya, 6/3 Dwarkanath Tagore Lane, Calcutta. 1948.

The 2nd edition of the second volume of Mr. Mukhopadhyaya's projected biography of Tagore in three volumes is not only a completely revised and enlarged edition of the earlier book, published many years ago, but is in a way the most comprehensive account of the age in which the Poet lived. Not only this, for Mr. Mukhopadhyaya has given full consideration to all the latest researches that have been done on Tagore and to all his letters and other personal papers which have appeared in the vernacular and English press after his death.

Naturally enough, the present account of Rabindranath's literary activities between his fortieth and fifty-seventh years has to extend to five hundred pages: the more so in view of the fact that, besides describing the various kinds of movements with which the Poet was directly and indirectly associated, Mr. Mukhopadhyaya has also given us the genesis of many of the poems, plays and novels that Tagore wrote in the period under survey. For instance, while dealing with the new phase of Tagore's novel writing, we have been told how *Chokher Bali* and *Naṣṭanidhi* had come to be written, while in the sections on *Śarodotsava* and the English *Gītāñjalī*, we are given vivid pictures of the creative impulses that drove Tagore to practice such varied forms of literary art. Examples can be multiplied of the writing of *Balākā*, *Phālgunī*, *Caturanga*, *Ghare*

and the English books *Nationalism* and *Personality*. The section on English *Gītāñjali* would remove many wrong notions that are current about the genesis of that book, while the chapter on *Bal:kā* contains such extracts from not-so-well-known letters that we get an altogether new view of the poet's creative fervour.

In all instances the fact remains that Mr. Mukhopadhyaya has spared no pains to look into all known and unknown material on Tagore before he has formed his judgement on his multifarious works. It is here, if one may at all find a flaw in this book, that Mr. Mukhopadhyaya has now and then erred on the point of holding an extreme opinion but this has been more than made up by the biographical amd bibliographical information that has been given. It is true that, as in the section on *Phālgunī*, for instance, quotations from Thompson and others are slightly out of place as these land the author in the arena of hotly contestable critical opinion; but then these can be justified if one looks into the subtitle of the book which is "*introduction to Tagore's works*". The combination of two such purposes makes the task difficult and if Mr. Mukhopadhyaya has chosen to omit nothing from his biography, the benefit of it is that the future scholar will have before him valuable material culled probably during the life-time of Tagore and published when many of his friends and associates are still alive. Such an approach naturally gives an authenticity to the book which, even if it does not state the official views of the *Viśva-Bhāratī* (the author says so in the preface), has at least the stamp of the *Viśva-Bhāratī* as the publisher.

In any case as a first-hand account of Tagore's life and activities, both literary and cultural, Mr. Mukhopadhyaya's present volume will hold its field for generations to come, and we eagerly look forward to the final volume.

JANAGANER RABINDRANATH: by Sudhir Kar, Signet Press, 12 Bankim Chatterji Street, Calcutta; 1948.

Almost as a reply to the view held in certain quarters that the aristocrat Tagore did not understand the common man, Mr. Kar's present book will be an eye-opener to many. As a close associate of Tagore during the last days of his life, Mr. Kar had known the poet's ideals well enough to state categorically that in his songs and political essays, in his *Viśva-Bhārati* and in his novels and dramas, the Poet had not only evinced considerable sympathy for the poor and the down-trodden but had suggested definite ways and means for removing their troubles.

In seven well written essays that make this book, Mr. Kar has studied the various phases of Tagore's creative work from the point of view of finding out how much consideration he had shown to the masses, and the author has successfully used the published and unpublished works of Tagore to convince us that if Tagore's music is instinct with the appeal of the folk song, his poetry abounds in messages for the masses, and his political essays study their difficulties in their complete social bearings. Some of the quotations that Mr. Kar has put together throw new light on the poetic achievements of Tagore, while the last section *Janaganer Mājhe Rabīndranath* brings to the book the touch of a vivid personal appeal. One only wished that Mr. Kar was able to remove the impression that Tagore wrote poetry only for the masses which an unwary reading of the book leaves behind; a short section emphasising the totality of Tagore's genius would have made Mr. Kar's point of view beyond any chances of being misunderstood.

RABINDRANATH (PRATHAM PARVA): by Ashoke Sen; H. Sirkar and Sons, 3 A Library Road, Kalighat, Calcutta 26, 1949.

Mr. Sen's present book should not be taken as systematic study either of a period of Rabindranath's poetry or of a particular phase of it. On the other hand Mr. Sen has chosen at random some poems of Tagore to be considered under three heads: (1) Tagore as the worshipper of beauty (ii) his use of movement in poetry and (iii) his *Puravī* which Mr. Sen treats as a landmark in the poet's career.

The consequence is that quite often Mr. Sen's treatment is sketchy and his view-point vitiated for lack of evidence. In the section on Tagore's idea of Beauty, Mr. Sen has contented himself with a few platitudes, while again in the section on Tagore's dynamics of thought, the author has ended with a quotation from C. E. M. Joad to show that Tagore almost completely believed in Bergson's theory of the èlan vital. For illustrating the former, Mr. Sen has given a cursory explanation of some such poems as *Pūrṇimā*, *Citrā*, *Urvaśī* and *Vijayinī* without giving the least consideration to what Tagore himself wrote on Beauty; for developing the second stand—point, short notes on *Duḥsamaya* and on some poems from *Balākā* are added. What is perhaps more suggestive is the scientific evidence that Mr. Sen has brought in to explain some poems of *Balākā* and the quotations from Russel, and Longwell and Flint are interesting in this regard. It is here that Mr. Sen has given a suggestion for some future scholar to work upon: to show how contemporary scientific knowledge came to influence the poetic thought and imagery of Tagore.

RABINDRA SĀHITYĀDARŚA : by Prabasjivan Choudhury : Samskṛti Baithak, 17, Panditia Place, Calcutta. 1949.

Rabindranath's theory of literature is the subject matter of this short, yet interesting volume where, for the first time Mr. Choudhury puts before us a synoptic view of what Tagore understood by 'literature', and of its connection with humanity, truth, beauty, the Good, and science. In the Poet's idea of literature, the predominant notion was that literature enables us to achieve a close contact with the universal, the greater world of men and Nature, and once this is accepted, it is no more difficult to see man not merely as an individual but as a part of a greater order. It is here that the understanding of men should be preceded by the understanding of Man; in fact, a complete understanding of literature is possible only when the author as well as the reader have seen in themselves deep flashes of self-revelation and understanding. Science, so far as it tries to dichotomise this understanding, is an intrusion in literature but the moment it contributes to the fuller understanding of the humankind, science has its contribution to make. Accepting this limitation, literature is partly aided by science towards the complete appreciation of Truth and Beauty, though Tagore believed that these ultimately lead to *Maṅgala*. With Tagore this idea is not, as Mr. Choudhury rightly emphasises, an ethical idea but rather, as Tagore felt it, the most fundamental idea without which all great literature would lose its final justification for existence. Literature is a source of joy to us because of this, and the individual talent does not merely contribute to the making of the tradition but is made by it as well.

These are some of the issues that Tagore had discussed in his various statements on literature, and it must be said to the credit of Mr. Choudhury that he has rescued these from apparent oblivion towards the making of an

outline of Tagore's theory of literature. Written in English, the book would have placed Tagore in the category of some of the most important literary theorists of his age.

SMRTI KATHĀ : by Upendranath Gangopadhyaya ; D. M. Library, 42, Cornwallis Street, Calcutta. 1951.

The present volume of Mr. Gangopadhyaya's reminiscences, while giving us an intimate picture of the first quarter of the twentieth century, incidentally describes the background against which the author himself, a distinguished Bengali novelist, rose into literary eminence. For a middle-class Bengali who was observing the life of the age in which Upendranath grew, it was difficult to discover anything like a romance of events but then Mr. Gangopadhyaya's mind was saturated in its own romance and its desire to create. The intensity of these can be felt when one reads through this lively account which, fortunately for us, also provides us with a vividly penetrating description of Saratchandra's emergence as a novelist. Not only this; we get here a glimpse of the mind of the earlier Saratchandra whose primary ambition, for a while, was to become an essayist first and a novelist afterwards. Incidentally enough, we also get in this book an interesting record of the literary ideals of the years 1900-1915 : in the peculiar approach that Suresh Samajapati and Phani Pal had to Saratchandra's *Caritrahīn*. Mr. Gangopadhyaya's reminiscences should therefore supply some valuable material to the future chronicler of modern Bengali literature.

JANDER DEKHECHI, vol. 1 : by Hemendra Kumar Roy : New Age Publishers Ltd. 22, Canning Street, Calcutta. 1951.

Mr. Hemendra Kumar Roy is one of the eldest litterateures of Bengal and so his account of the persons he has met over a long span of years is bound to include anecdotes of several men and women of literary and dramatic distinction. This was because Mr. Roy had freely moved in a large society of literary persons some of whom were then at the height of their literary reputation while others were still struggling in their nonage. And since Mr. Roy is a discriminating observer of men and women he had been able to come so close to the many persons of his acquantance that he had been successful in eliciting their opinions on the forms that these literary persons had been practising. Mr. Roy has therefore been able to acquaint us with the literary ideas and ideals of authors like Swarna Kumari Devi, Prabhatkumar Mukhopadhyaya, Bipin Pal, Pramatha Choudhury, Dinesh Sen and Saratchandra Chatterji. In the sections on Pramatha Choudhury and Saratchandra, for instance, Mr. Roy has given us detailed statements of Pramatha's views on Bengali prose and of Saratchandra's ideal of the short story. Quite many such interesting quotations from the views that other prominent authors expressed on subjects of critical importance can be found in this book.

But this is not all. Mr. Roy has a life-long interest in, and a close association with the theat the consequence of which is that his portraits of some playwrights and actors shine with the brilliance of acute observation. For example, Mr. Roy gives us first-hand information of what Monomohan thought of contemporary stage, of what D. L. Roy understood of the historical drama, of Ardhendushekhar's ideas about the new stagecraft, and finally, of what Tarasundari felt about the role of the female actors on the Bengali stage.

Underlying all this description, however, runs a brief yet vivid account of the Bengali stage growing under the influence of Girish Ghosh and Dwijendralal Roy. This account will surely be as helpful to the future historian of the Bengali stage as would be Mr. Roy's anecdotes of various other authors towards their proper evaluation. This book, along with *Kallolayuga* and *Smṛtikathā*, will provide interesting material to a discerning critic of the Bengali literature.

BANGALAR LEKHAK, vol. 1 : by Pramathanatha Bisi : Vishva-Bharati Granthalaya, 6/3 Dwarkanath Tagore Lane, Calcutta. 1951.

The story of the development of the Bengali prose has not yet received sufficient critical attention at the hands of the critics, and whatever treatment it has received was either in the histories of Bengali literature or in a few books like *Bāṅgalīgadyera chārayuga*, *Bāṅgalī Gadyera Kathā* and *Bāṅgalāsāhityera Akdik*. But even in these books the emphasis had been more on the continuous evolution of the prose-form than on the intricacies of the prose styles of such oft-neglected masters as Shibnath Shastri, Trailokyanath Mukhopadhyaya, Rameshchandra Dutt and Haraprasad Shastri of yesterday, and Pramatha Choudhury, Balendranath, and Abanindranath of today. Between these two groups we can see almost the entire picture of an age : the former representing Bengal shaken by the impact of the Western civilization; the latter growing quietly after it had assimilated the influence. Consequently, the change in subject-matter as well as form is too apparent to be mistaken while in a way the second group can be taken to have normally emerged out of the former.

And these authors were not merely masters of Bengali prose—at least Rameshchandra Dutt and Haraprasad Shastri were leaders of thought as well, while Shibnath Shastri

can easily be taken to represent the whole age to which he belonged. At the other extreme is Pramatha Choudhury and Abanindranath Tagore : the former bringing a new verve to the Bengali prose; the latter, a new rhythm and grace that has the freshness and simplicity of the folktale. It is such a wide panoroma that Mr. Bisi has so efficiently put before us, and if he has once a while given us few biographical details, these are intended to relate the persons to their times. It is true that Mr. Bisi has occasionally treated novel and *belles lettres* together almost in the same breath but he has also given us a happy combination of the two in his chapter on Haraprasad Shastri. Mr. Bisi's analysis of the prose style of Abanindranath would go much towards drawing our attention to this other aspect of an artist's creative vitality, while the section on Balendranath would restore this artist in words to his native glory. The few opinions that Mr. Bisi expresses on Satishchandra and Ajit Chakravarty should inspire some publishers to publish a collected edition of their works, while in the section on Shibnath we quite miss the mention of his now-classic books *Ramtanu Lahidi O Tatkalina Bangiyasamāja* and *Ātmacarita*. It would also have been much better if to each essay was appended a list of the publications of the author concerned. But for these minor short-comings, it has to be said that Mr. Bisi's book will be an important contribution to the study of modern Bengali prose.

---

can easily be taken to represent the whole age to which he belonged. At the other extreme is Pramatha Chaudhuri and Abanindranath Tagore; the former bringing a new verve to the Bengali prose, the latter a new rhythm and grace that in its freshness and simplicity is [illegible]. It is such [illegible] phenomena that Mr. Bisi has to carefully [illegible] before us, and if he has on the whole given us the biographical details, these are intended to relate the persons to their [illegible]. It is true that Mr. Bisi has occasionally tried the novel and the *Kathā* together almost in the same breath but he [illegible] us a happy combination of the two in his chapter on Haraprasad Shastri. Mr. Bisi's analysis of the prose style of Abanindranath would go much towards drawing our attention to this other aspect of an artist's creative vitality, while the section on Rabindranath would restore this artist in words to his rightful glory. [illegible] few opinions that Mr. Bisi expresses on Satischandra and Ajit Chakravarty should inspire some publishers to publish a collected edition of their works, while in the section on Chaudhuri we quite miss the mention of his now-classic books *Rayatera Katha*, *O Taranga*, [illegible] and [illegible]. It would also have been much better if to each essay was appended a list of the publications of the author concerned. But for these minor shortcomings it has to be said that Mr. Bisi's book will be an important contribution to the study of modern Bengali prose.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

Indological Studies. By Bimala Churn Law, M. A., B. L., D.Lit. Part I 126 pages, 1950; Part II 407 pages, 1952. The Indian Research Institute, Calcutta.

Indologists the world over are very well acquainted with many fine works contributed by Dr. B. C. Law in recent years to the growing literature on several aspects of Indian history and culture. His studies have had a special reference to the Pali literature of Buddhism, though they are by no means confined to this field. He has now added one more laurel to the many he has already won by the publication of this collection of his Indological studies.

Part I comprises two long essays of about sixty pages each—History of monarchical and non-monarchical minor states in the period from 325 B. C. to 300 A. D., and Social and Economic Conditions from the earliest times down to the Nanda dynasty. A perusal of the essays amply bears out the learned author's claim that they have 'been written in a spirit of scientific research without the least intention to build up untenable theories and hypotheses'. The documentation is, as usual in his work, quite full and precise.

Except for three essays—called chapters here—on Jain history and philosophy comprising about sixty pages in all, Part II may well be described as chips from the Buddhist workshop of Dr. Law. In these essays he covers very wide ground in a vivacious and entertaining manner and deals with widely different subjects like monasticism, slavery, architecture, painting, literature, flora and what not, generally basing himself on Pali books. The collection is at once handy, interesting and useful. We congratulate Dr. Law on this signal achievement and wish him many years of joyful and instructive endeavour in his favourite studies.

—K. A. N. Sastri

———

THE VEDIC AGE. Being the I Volume of The Bhāratīya Itihāsa Samiti's HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE. Edited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M. A., Ph. D., F. R. A. S. B. and Dr. A. D. Pusalkar, M. A., LL. B., Ph. D. Prepared under the directions of the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan's President The Hon. Dr. K. M. Munshi and with a Foreword by him. Published by George Allen & Unwin Ltd., London. Second Impression 1952. pp. 565. Price 35s. net.

Of late several proposals to write a comprehensive, up to date and authentic history of India have been made. It is a matter of satisfaction that at least one of them, sponsored by the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavana of Bombay, has at last materialised, and now it is for the scholars and the students of history to determine if the task of making proposals is over.

The genesis and the nature of this HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE have been thus explained in the Foreword : "In the past Indians laid little store by history. Our available sources of information are inadequate, and in so far as they are foreign, are almost invariably tainted with a bias towards India's conquerors. Research is meagre and disconnected. . . As a result, they do not present a true picture of India's past, nor do they explain how Indians resisted the Turk, Afghan and Mughal incursions, how they reacted to the vicissitudes through which in consequence they passed, and how a Renaissance sprang up out of the impact of Indian with Persian and Turkish cultures. . . The treatment of the British period in most of our histories is equally defective. It generally reads like an unofficial report of the British conquest and of the benefits derived by India from it. It does not give us the real India; nor does it present a picture of what we saw, felt and suffered, of how we reacted to foreign influences, or of the values and organisations we created out of the

impact with the West." The history of India that this volume initiates intends to rectify all these defects.

Indeed, in this light the series has been planned also on somewhat unusual lines. They have thus allotted nearly half of the entire space to the Hindu period.

While there is much truth in the various kinds of errors pointed out in the historical perspective hitherto presented in the books on the history of India, a question is raised if history as a science should be at all written to prove or emphasize any particular theses. In other words, is a historian justified in being biased in his task—even though it may be a bias in favour of India ? May we not be guilty of overvaluations and underlinings in our enthusiasm to correct the foreign writers ?

Nobody need understand that we are against proper corrections but we must be cautious of being over-enthusiastic.

On the whole, the authors of this volume—Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Rao Bahadur K. N. Dikshit, D. N. Wadia, Dr. G. P. Majumdar, B. K. Chatterji, Dr. H. D. Sankalia, Dr. S. K. Chatterji, Dr. A. D. Pusalker, Dr. B. K. Ghosh, Dr. V. M. Apte, Dr. M. A. Mehendale—have acquitted themselves well and are not guilty of this. In particular the General Editor Dr. R. C. Majumdar is responsible for the evenness, moderation and balance of opinions and facts presented.

There are seven Books in the volume:

I. Introduction.
II. The Pre-historic Age.
III. The Aryans in India.
IV. Historical Tradition.
V. The Age of the Rik Samhita.
VI. The Age of the Later Samhitas.
VII. The Age of the Upanishads and Sūtras.

Each section has been properly linked up with the preceding one and is discussed from political, literary, legal, religious and socio-economic viewpoints. Appropriate illustrations, good and critical bibliographies, appendices and valuable index make the work as complete and useful as it could be made.

In a work of this nature and of such magnitude, generally speaking it is not possible to include any original research. In many cases therefore a summary of all that has been investigated so far alone are given—in some cases even this information on difficult but relevant subjects like geological, geographical and biological background of Indian history is not available except by the patient study of bulky volumes of a highly technical nature, which few would be disposed to undertake.

And yet on two topics, for example, one expected something more than a mere summing up : on the Aryans and on the "traditional" history chiefly as given in the Purāṇas and epics. On the subject of the Aryans, the Editor has allowed divergent views as being not only inevitable but also as they impress upon the readers that such questions do admit of different answers and enable them to judge for themselves the cogency of the arguments on which different theories are based. One wishes that a synthetic and a more consolidated picture of the subject would have been better : thus the arguments in favour of the indigenous origin of the Aryans ought to have been more carefully and comprehensively studied and scientifically examined—they do not include, for example, what the Hon. Dr. Sampurnananda has said on the subject in his work *Āryon kā Deśa*.

Similarly, one expected much more than a mere repetition of Pargiter's conclusions on traditional history. Pargiter's work needs a thorough revision and supplementing. We are glad to note the Editor has acknowledged what the

pure Sanskritists have been feeling for a long time, that it is totally erroneous to ignore the data, particularly the royal genealogies, contained in the Purāṇas and the Epics as merely fanciful and mythological in historical works. Of course, ultimately for an accurate account of this kind it is very necessary to have critical editions of these works. Happily, the *Mahābhārata* is being edited at Poona and the Rāmāyaṇa at Baroda. We are glad to note that the newly founded Mithila Institute at Darbhanga is going to edit the Purāṇas.

We cannot too strongly recommend this volume to all those who are interested in the history of India; it seems it has now come to stay with us as one of our permanent treasures. We hope the remaining nine volumes will soon follow.

THE AGE OF IMPERIAL UNITY. Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan's HISTORY AND CULTURE OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE. Vol II. Editor—R. C. Majumdar : Asst. Editor—A. D. Pusalkar. Foreword by K. M. Munshi. Pages Lxiii+, 733, maps 4, Plates xxxvii covering 91 figures. Price Rs. 35. Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan, Bombay.

This is the second volume of the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan's History and Culture of the Indian People in ten volumes. The volume under review deals from the beginning of what is termed as the historic period viz. the 16 great states of North India in the 6th century B. C. down to the beginning of the Gupta period in 320 A. D. This falls into two distinct periods :—(1) The period of organisation (6th century B. C. to 150 B. C.) in which there was an aggressive upheaval of strength and spirit, an all-sided efflorescence when the fabric of Indian Culture was well and truly woven ; and (2) the period of international contacts and cultural expansion (150 B. C. to A. D. 320) during which

the culture first assimilated the foreign elements and then reasserted its values with new vigour and intensity.

Consistent with the title of the series the political history of the period covers 242 pages while the culture of the period covering 416 pages is divided into seven divisions : Language and literature, Political theory and administrative system, Law and legal institutions, Religion and philosophy, Art and Architecture, Social and economic conditions including Education and Colonial and Cultural expansion.

The rise of the empires of Chandragupta Maurya and Asoka is the central theme of the book. The political history is treated fully. Alexander's invasion and its effects which up to now loomed large in books on Indian history get their proper place assigned. Chandra Gupta Maurya and Asoka are treated in full. The causes of the downfall of the Maurya Empire have been a point of debate among historians; and the editor has not favoured the view that the doctrine of Ahimsa or non-injury adopted by Asoka as a policy of state was responsible for its downfall; and states that the Empire would have fallen to pieces sooner or later even if Asoka had followed the policy of blood and iron of his grand-father. Sor.ehow the moral ascendency of Indian Culture over a large part of the civilized world which Asoka was mainly instrumental in bringing about remained for centuries a monument to her glory along with his Edicts and their contents. The date of Kanishka as A. D. 78 is still debatable but accepted as a working hypothesis. The date of Vikramāditya as 58 B. C. is not accepted for lack of positive evidence. South India and Ceylon played but a minor part during this period.

The culture of this period is dealt with fully. The chapter on Religion and Plulosophy occupies 120 pages and the four stages of Buddhism are treated exhaustively. Art and architecture occupies 60 pages. The chapters

on the Colonial and Cultural expansion of India by R. C. Majumdar coming from an expert in that branch of Indian History are very well written. One refreshing section is the section on the influence of Dharma Shāstras upon the Economic developments where it is accurately pointed out that the Smritis do not support the restriction of separate crafts and trades to different sub-castes. On the contrary we find in Manu and his successors a growing recognition of the Shudra's right to productive occupation. The Smritis which developed in this age still form the bedrock of modern Hinduism in spite of the accretion of silt deposits of later ages. The *Arthashastra's* date is still a puzzle and hence the political theory and administration envisaged by it has been treated as a separate picture complete by itself. This picture must be true of some part of the period between 300 B. C. and A. D. 300 though one may not be able to specify it within still narrower limits. On the perplexing question of the origin of Mauryan Art and of the Buddha's images no dogmatic view is asserted.

The volume printed in India augurs well and when completed would supersede the Cambridge History of India series ; and would be used as a text book and as the basis for research in our Universities, Archæological Societies and Research Institutes.

SANSKRIT LITERATURE. By K. Chandrasekharan and V. H. Subramania Sastri. No. 12 of the P. E. N. Books on the Indian Literatures. Published by the International Book House Ltd., Bombay 1, for the P. E. N. All-India Centre, Aryasangha, Malabar Hill, Bombay 6. Price Rs. 6. 1951. Pages 213+87. ←

We are glad to note that the Indian centre of the P. E. N. has resumed its series on the Indian literatures. The volume under review has been published as a part of it.

F. 17

Truly observes the General Editor Madame Sophia Wadia : "no study of the literatures of India is complete without a study of the treasure-house of Sanskrit literature and even a general acquaintance with Sanskrit as a language enriches the mind and the heart."

Unfortunately—and this we are most reluctantly constrained to say at the very outset—the brochure that has been prepared has not at all come up to the high standard of the earlier volumes in this series. Perhaps the authors were not acquainted well with the nature and the scope of the requirements of this Series. There are vague, irrelevant and one may say even flimsy statements made. There is hardly any effort to arrange and show the development of Sanskrit literature : when the authors ultimately come to talk about the Sanskrit literary figures after a rambling of about 95 pages they merely jot down the names without caring to evaluate them as minor or major writers. The result is that such names are mentioned side by side—Kālidāsa, Bhāravi, Kumāradāsa, Śivaswāmin, Abhinanda, Atula, Śrī Harṣa, Vedānta Deṣika, Kshamabai Row.

It would have been much better to give 10 pages only to the general things—which by the way should have been more specific and pertinent to the subject—and about 90 pages to an account of the various literary developments.

Sometimes there is an ignorance of even well-known facts: Jayadeva of *Prasanna Rāghava* fame is not at all the author of *Gītagovinda* because their dates and parentage differ widely; but the authors have still a doubt about this very well-known fact.

We wish the volume could have been revised by some competent men before being published.

BHĀRATAVARṢA KĀ BṚHAD ITIHĀSA, Vol. I, By Shri Bhagavaddatta, B.A., of Lahore, Published by the Bharatiya Sahitya Bhavana, 9926, Library Road, Delhi 6. Pages 16+338. Price Rs. 16. Saṁvat 2008.

The book under review is indeed a very desirable contribution to the History of India. Shri Bhagavaddatta is a well-known scholar. He has been working on the subject for several years and has other books on Indian History to his credit.

The present book has been planned in several volumes. This is the first volume in twelve well-written chapters. The author has quoted the views of almost all his predecessors on various problems of Indian History and examined them thoroughly and has proved that their views are all based and influenced by the prejudiced views of the foreigners. He has convinced us in the book that books on India will have to be re-written, free from prejudices and based on authentic sources.

The author has very carefully proceeded with the work and has shown how a correct history can be written. The stand-point maintained throughout the book is purely Indian and quite scientifie. It contains information not easily found in one place.

We may not agree wlth all that has been expressed in the book, but it is indeed a very informative and well-written book on the subject. The author has taken great pains to collect proper material from all the literatures of the country. Every statement of the book has been substantiated from authorities already recognised. The book is very comprehensive and is a work of great learning. No student of Indian History can neglect to go through it.

But as the plan is so big and as the author himself is not rich enough to publish all tne volumes, it is not easy to get all the volumes published. This is an irony

of fate which scholarship has to face very often. However, both the author and the publisher deserve our best congratulations and encouragement. We wish them every success in their attempt.

INDEX TO VOLUME VIII

Articles

Authors

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

THE INSTITUTE AFFAIRS

OPINIONS

ON

SANSKRIT DOCUMENTS

...." it will be very useful to Historians of that period in its presentation of unique and interesting material. I hope that the great riches of the National Archives will continue to be publicized in such valuable form."—Dr. Horace I, Poleman Librarian India Section, Congress Library, U. S. A.

" Splendid publication."—Giuseppe Tucci, Institute Italiano Per Il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Rome.

" Though primarily interesting of course, on account of their historical contents, the documents also contain some points of interest for the student of Indian linguistics ..the learned editors seem to have fulfilled their task very well."—Prof. F.B.J. Kuiper, Prof. of Sanskrit, State University of Leyden, Netherlands.

..." highly interesting and valuable publication. It is if I am not mistaken, the first work of the kind, and very useful to be aware that Sanskrit was not only a language for kavis or philosophers, but also a precise instrument for every day purposes. Your edition is excellent, notes and indexes are particularly well arranged and complete."—Prof. Jean Filliozat Secretaire, Societe Asiatique, Paris.

I have read this valuable book with great interest and great profit. The documents themselves are very interesting and the notes and commentaries are full of useful information. Some of the texts published are real " human documents " which shed light on the history of Indian Civilisation during stirring times. Moreover, they show how Sanskrit continued to have a hold on educated people.—Dr. J. Gouda; Prof. of Sanskrit, State University of Utrecht, Netherlands.

The " Documents " are a really valuable collection, ably edited and translated, for they throw useful and interesting side-lights on the political and social events of their time,—Dr. L. D. Barnett, Londen.